arXiv:0902.0413v2 [math.CA] 3 Feb 2009

On the number of real critical points of logarithmic derivatives and the Hawaii conjecture

Mikhail Tyaglov
Institut für Mathematik, MA 4–5
Technische Universität Berlin
D–10623 Berlin, Germany
tyaglov@math.tu-berlin.de

February 3, 2009

Dedicated with gratitude to Thomas Craven, George Csordas, and Wayne Smith.

Abstract

For a given real entire function φ with finitely many nonreal zeros, we establish a connection between the number of real zeros of the functions $Q = (\varphi'/\varphi)'$ and $Q_1 = (\varphi''/\varphi')'$. This connection leads to a proof of the Hawaii conjecture [T. Craven, G. Csordas, and W. Smith, The zeros of derivatives of entire functions and the Pólya-Wiman conjecture, Ann. of Math. (2) 125 (1987), 405–431] stating that the number of real zeros of Q does not exceed the number of nonreal zeros of φ.

Introduction

In this paper, we investigate the real critical points of logarithmic derivatives of real entire function, $\varphi(z)$, in the class $\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ (see Definition 2). Our main result establishes bounds on the number of real zeros of the derivative of the logarithmic derivative of the function $\varphi(z)$. The idea behind these bounds arose from attempts to prove the following twenty year-old conjecture of T. Craven, G. Csordas and W. Smith [3] (see also [5]), which was nicknamed by A. Eremenko the Hawaii conjecture.

The Hawaii conjecture. *If a real polynomial p has $2m$ nonreal zeros, then the rational function*

$$Q(z) = \frac{d}{dz}\left(\frac{p'(z)}{p(z)}\right), \quad \textit{where} \quad p'(z) = \frac{dp(z)}{dz},$$

has at most $2m$ real zeros, counting multiplicities.

Various attempts were made to resolve this conjecture by geometric and topologic methods [2, 6, 7]. In particular, J. Borcea and B. Shapiro [2] developed a general theory of level sets, which

may imply the validity of the Hawaii conjecture as a special case. In [13, Chapter 9], the Hawaii conjecture was proved only for a few particular cases.

We remark that while the upper bound of the number of real zeros of Q was only conjectured recently, the lower bound was known a long time ago, at least in the following special case:

Problem 133 ([9]). *Let the real polynomial $f(x)$ have only real zeros and suppose that the polynomial $f(x)+a$, where $a \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$, has $2m$ nonreal zeros. Prove that the equation $(f'(x))^2 - f(x)f''(x) - af''(x) = 0$ has at least $2m$ real roots.*

If $p(z) = f(z) + a$, then it follows that p has only simple zeros and exactly $2m$ nonreal zeros. Moreover, $p' = f'$ has only real zeros. By Problem 133, Q associated with the polynomial $p(z) = f(z) + a$ has at least $2m$ real zeros. In fact, Q has exactly $2m$ real zeros [3, Theorem 1]. The hint provided for Problem 133 in [9] suggests using Rolle's Theorem. This approach ultimately leads us to a more precise result, namely, the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *Suppose that the polynomial p has $2m$ nonreal zeros and its derivative p' has $2m_1$ nonreal zeros, then Q has at least $2m - 2m_1$ real zeros.*

Thus, the lower bound of the number of real zeros of Q can be easily determined. Unfortunately, even this simple fact was not well known. We establish this lower bound in Theorem 2 (see (1.154) and Remark 1.14).

In Section 1, we prove our main result, Theorem 2, which provides the bounds of the number of critical points of the logarithmic derivative of a real entire function $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ (Definition 2) possessing *property A* (Definition 4). In Section 2, we prove the Hawaii conjecture (Theorem 8) for real entire functions in the class $\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ using Theorem 2 and one technical result, Theorem 7.

1 Bounds on the number of real critical points of the logarithmic derivatives of functions in $\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$

In this section, we need the following definitions.

Definition 1 ([10, 12])**.** *The function φ is said to be in the Laguerre-Pólya class, $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}$, if*

$$\varphi(z) = cz^d e^{-\gamma z^2 + \beta z} \prod_{j=1}^{\omega} \left(1 - \frac{z}{\alpha_j}\right) e^{\frac{z}{\alpha_j}}, \quad (0 \leqslant \omega \leqslant \infty),$$

where $c, \beta, \alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $\gamma \geqslant 0$, d is a nonnegative integer and $\sum \alpha_j^{-2} < \infty$.

Definition 2. *The function φ is in the class $\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ if $\varphi = pf$ where $f \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}$ and p is a real polynomial with no real zeros.*

For $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$, by $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\varphi)$ we denote the number of nonreal zeros of φ, counting multiplicities. If f is a real meromorphic function having only a finite number of real zeros, then $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(f)$ will denote the number of real zeros of f, counting multiplicities. In the sequel, we also denote the number of zeros of the function f in an interval (a, b) and at a point $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ by $Z_{(a,b)}(f)$ and $Z_{\{\alpha\}}(f)$, respectively[1]. Generally, the number of zeros of f on a set X will be denoted by $Z_X(f)$.

[1]Thus, $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(f) = Z_{(-\infty,+\infty)}(f)$.

Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$. Between any two consecutive real zeros, say a and b, $a < b$, of φ, φ' has an *odd* number of real zeros (and *a fortiori* at least one) by Rolle's theorem. Counting all zeros with multiplicities, suppose that φ' has $2r+1$ zeros between a and b. Then we will say that φ' has $2r$ *extra zeros* between a and b. If φ has the largest zero a_L (or the smallest zero a_S), then any real zero φ' in (a_L, ∞) (and in $(-\infty, a_S)$) is also called an *extra zero* of φ'. The total number of extra zeros of φ', counting multiplicities, will be denoted by $E(\varphi')$.

Remark 1.1. The multiple real zeros of φ are not counted as real extra zeros of φ'.

Remark 1.2. Let φ be a real polynomial of degree $n \geqslant 1$, and suppose that φ has exactly $2m$ nonreal zeros. Then

$$E(\varphi') = \begin{cases} Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\varphi) - Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\varphi'), & \text{if } n > 2m, \\ Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\varphi) - Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\varphi') - 1, & \text{if } n = 2m. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

This fact will be used in the proof of Theorem 3.

For the reader's convenience, we recall the fact proved in [3, Lemma 3, p. 411] that the following inequalities hold for $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$.

$$Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\varphi) \leqslant E(\varphi') + Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\varphi') \leqslant Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\varphi) + 2. \tag{1.2}$$

However, if φ has an infinite number of real zeros, then a tighter upper bound can be established (see [4, p. 325]):

$$Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\varphi) \leqslant E(\varphi') + Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\varphi') \leqslant Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\varphi') + 1. \tag{1.3}$$

Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ and let the function $Q = Q[\varphi]$ associated with φ be defined as

$$Q(z) = Q[\varphi](z) = \frac{d}{dz}\left(\frac{\varphi'(z)}{\varphi(z)}\right) = \frac{\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) - (\varphi'(z))^2}{(\varphi(z))^2}. \tag{1.4}$$

We note that if $\varphi(z) = Ce^{\beta z}$, where $C, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, then $Q(z) \equiv 0$. Hence, we adopt the following convention throughout this paper.

Convention. *If $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$, then φ is assumed not to be of the form $\varphi(z) = Ce^{\beta z}$, $C, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$.*

With this convention, we set out to prove that Q has only *finitely* many real zeros. This fact is essentially known from [3], but we still include the proof for completeness. Note that this is obvious if φ has a finite number of zeros. Here is a proof for the general case.

Theorem 1. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$. Then the function Q has finitely many real zeros.*

Proof. By definition, φ is a product $\varphi = p\psi$, where $\psi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}$ and p is a real polynomial with no real zeros. Let $\deg p = 2m \geqslant 0$.

If $m = 0$, then $p(z) \equiv const$. In this case, $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}$. But it is well known (see, for example, [3, 4]) that the logarithmic derivative of a function from the Laguerre-Pólya class is a decreasing function on the intervals where it has no poles. Therefore, $Q(z) < 0$ for any real z, which is not a pole of this function. Thus, if $m = 0$, then Q has no real zeros.

We assume now that $m > 0$. Observe that

$$Q = Q[\varphi] = Q[p] + Q[\psi].$$

From this equality it follows that all zeros of Q are roots of the equation

$$Q[p](z) = -Q[\psi](z). \tag{1.5}$$

It is easy to see that if $p(z) = a_0 z^{2m} + \dots$ $(a_0 \neq 0)$, then

$$Q[p](z) = \frac{-2ma_0^2 z^{4m-2} + \dots}{a_0^2 z^{4m} + \dots}.$$

This formula shows that $Q[p](z) \to -0$ whenever $z \to \pm\infty$. Consequently, there exist two real numbers a_1 and a_2 $(a_1 < a_2)$ such that $Q[p](z) < 0$ for $z \in (-\infty, a_1] \cup [a_2, +\infty)$. But since $\psi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}$, we have $Q[\psi](z) < 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$ as we mentioned above. Thus, the right hand side of the equation (1.5) is positive for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$ but its left hand side is negative for all $z \in (-\infty, a_1] \cup [a_2, +\infty)$. Therefore, all real roots of the equation (1.5) and, consequently, all real zeros of the function Q belong to the interval (a_1, a_2), and $Q(z) < 0$ outside this interval. Since real zeros of a meromorphic function are isolated, Q has only finitely many real zeros, as required. □

Later (see Corollary 2) we show that the number of real zeros of the function Q is even.

Analogously to (1.4), we introduce the related function

$$Q_1(z) = Q[\varphi'](z) = \frac{d}{dz}\left(\frac{\varphi''(z)}{\varphi'(z)}\right) = \frac{\varphi'(z)\varphi'''(z) - (\varphi''(z))^2}{(\varphi'(z))^2}. \tag{1.6}$$

To expedite our presentation, we also introduce the following definition.

Definition 3. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ and let α be a real zero of φ. Suppose that β_1 and β_2, $\beta_1 < \alpha < \beta_2$, are real zeros of φ' such that $\varphi'(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (\beta_1, \alpha) \cup (\alpha, \beta_2)$. The function φ is said to possess* ***property A at its real zero*** *α if Q has no real zeros in at least one of the intervals (β_1, α) and (α, β_2). If α is the smallest zero of φ, then set $\beta_1 = -\infty$, and if α is the largest zero of φ, then set $\beta_2 = +\infty$.*

Definition 4. *A function $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ is said to possess* ***property A*** *if φ possesses property A at each of its real zeros. In particular, φ without real zeros possesses property A.*

At the end of this section, we prove the following theorem, which provides bounds for the number of real zeros of Q.

Theorem 2. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ and suppose that φ has exactly $2m$ nonreal zeros. If the function φ possesses property A, then*

$$2m - 2m_1 \leqslant Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) \leqslant 2m - 2m_1 + Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_1), \tag{1.7}$$

where $2m_1 = Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\varphi')$ and the functions Q and Q_1 are defined in (1.4) *and* (1.6).

Before we establish Theorem 2, we prove a few lemmas and their corollaries. For a given function φ, by F and F_1 we will denote the following functions

$$F(z) = \varphi(z)\varphi''(z) - \left(\varphi'(z)\right)^2, \quad F_1(z) = \varphi'(z)\varphi'''(z) - \left(\varphi''(z)\right)^2. \tag{1.8}$$

At first, we estimate the parities of the numbers of real zeros of Q in certain intervals and on the real axis.

Lemma 1. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ and let β_1 and β_2 be two real zeros of φ'.*

I. *If β_1 and β_2 are consecutive real zeros of φ', and $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (\beta_1, \beta_2)$, then Q has an odd number of real zeros in (β_1, β_2), counting multiplicities.*

II. *If β_1 and β_2 are two real zeros of φ' such that φ has a unique real zero α in (β_1, β_2) and $\varphi'(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (\beta_1, \alpha) \cup (\alpha, \beta_2)$, then Q has an even number of real zeros, counting multiplicities, in each of the intervals (β_1, α) and (α, β_2).*

Proof. I. In fact, since φ'/φ equals zero at the points β_1 and β_2, its derivative, the function Q, has an odd number of zeros in (β_1, β_2) by Rolle's theorem.

II. If α is a zero of φ of multiplicity $M \geqslant 1$, then $\varphi(z) = (z-\alpha)^M \psi(z)$, where $\psi(\alpha) \neq 0$. Thus, we have

$$Q(z) = -\frac{M}{(z-\alpha)^2} + \frac{\psi(z)\psi''(z) - (\psi'(z))^2}{(\psi(z))^2}.$$

Consequently, for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$Q(\alpha \pm \varepsilon) < 0. \tag{1.9}$$

Thus, φ'/φ is decreasing in a small left-sided vicinity of α, and $\varphi'(z)/\varphi(z) \to -\infty$ whenever $z \nearrow \alpha$. Since φ'/φ equals zero at β_1, its derivative, the function Q, must have an even number of zeros in (β_1, α) by Rolle's theorem.

By the same argumentation, Q has an even number of zeros in (α, β_2). □

Lemma 2. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$. If φ has the largest zero α_L (or the smallest zero α_S), then Q has an even number of real zeros in $(\alpha_L, +\infty)$ (or in $(-\infty, \alpha_S)$), counting multiplicities.*

Proof. The inequality (1.9) holds for any real zero of φ, consequently, Q is negative for z sufficiently close to α_L (or to α_S). But it was already proved in Theorem 1 (see also (3.11) in [3, p.415] and subsequent remark there) that $Q(z) < 0$ for all sufficiently large real z. Therefore, Q has an even number of zeros in $(\alpha_L, +\infty)$ (and in $(-\infty, a_S)$ if φ has the smallest real zero α_S), counting multiplicities, since $Q(z)$ is negative for all real z sufficiently close to the ends of the interval $(\alpha_L, +\infty)$ (or of the interval $(-\infty, \alpha_S)$). □

If additional information on the number of real zeros of φ' is available, then Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 can be used to derive the following sharper result.

Corollary 1. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ and suppose that φ has the largest zero α_L and φ' has exactly r extra zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval $(\alpha_L, +\infty)$. If β_L is the largest zero of φ' in $(\alpha_L, +\infty)$, then Q has an odd (even) number of real zeros in $(\beta_L, +\infty)$ whenever r is an even (odd) number.*

Proof. Let φ' have $l \leqslant r$ *distinct* zeros, say $\beta_1 < \beta_2 < \ldots < \beta_l = \beta_L$, in the interval $(\alpha_L, +\infty)$. According to Lemma 2, Q has an even number of real zeros in $(\alpha_L, +\infty)$, counting multiplicities. But from Lemma 1 it follows that Q has an even number of real zeros in (α_L, β_1), counting multiplicities, and an odd number of real zeros, say $2M_i + 1$, in each of the intervals (β_i, β_{i+1}) $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, l-1)$. Hence, Q has exactly $\sum_{i=1}^{l-1}(2M_i + 1)$ real zeros, counting multiplicities, in $\bigcup_{i=1}^{l-1}(\beta_i, \beta_{i+1})$.

Moreover, from (1.4) it follows that β is a zero of Q of multiplicity $M-1$ whenever β is a zero of φ' of multiplicity M. Consequently, in our case, Q has exactly $r-l$ real zeros, counting multiplicities,

at the points β_i that are multiple zeros of φ'. Thus, Q has $r-l+\sum_{i=1}^{l-1}(2M_i+1) = r-1+\sum_{i=1}^{l-1}2M_i$ real zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval $[\beta_1, \beta_L]$. Therefore, if r is an even (odd) number, then Q has an odd (even) number of real zeros in $(\alpha_L, \beta_L]$. Recall that Q has an even number of zeros in (α_L, β_1) by Lemma 1. Consequently, Q has an odd (even) number of real zeros in $(\beta_L, +\infty)$, since Q has an even number of real zeros in $(\alpha_L, +\infty)$, according to Lemma 2. □

Remark 1.3. Corollary 1 is valid with respective modification in the case when φ has the smallest zero a_S.

So far, we have considered semi-infinite intervals, our next statement addresses the entire real axis.

Corollary 2 (Craven–Csordas–Smith [3], p. 415)**.** *If $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$, then the function Q associated with φ has an even number of real zeros, counting multiplicity.*

Proof. In fact, if φ has no real zeros, then Q has no real poles, and the number $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q)$ is even, since $Q(z) < 0$ for all sufficiently large real z.

If φ has only one real zero α, then, according to Lemma 2, Q has an even number of zeros in each of the intervals $(-\infty, \alpha)$ and $(\alpha, +\infty)$. Thus, $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q)$ is also even in this case.

Let φ have at least two real zeros. If α_j and α_{j+1} are two consecutive zeros of φ, then, according to (1.9), Q has an even number of zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval (α_j, α_{j+1}). If φ has the largest (or/and the smallest) real zero, say α_L (α_S), then, by Lemma 2, Q has an even number of real zeros, counting multiplicities, in $(a_L, +\infty)$ (and in $(-\infty, \alpha_S)$). Therefore, the number $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q)$ is even. □

Remark 1.4. Analogously, the function Q_1 associated with a function in the class $\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ has an even number of real zeros, counting multiplicities, since the class $\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ is closed with respect to differentiation [3].

The following lemma is the first in a series of lemmata that estimate the number of real zeros of Q on a finite interval, given specific information on φ, φ', φ'' and Q_1.

Lemma 3. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ and let a and b be real and let $\varphi(z) \neq 0$, $\varphi'(z) \neq 0$, $\varphi''(z) \neq 0$, $Q_1(z) \neq 0$ in the interval (a, b).*

I. *If, for all sufficiently small $\delta > 0$,*

$$\varphi'(a+\delta)\varphi''(a+\delta)Q(a+\delta)Q_1(a+\delta) > 0, \tag{1.10}$$

then Q has no real zeros in $(a, b]$.

II. *If, for all sufficiently small $\delta > 0$,*

$$\varphi'(a+\delta)\varphi''(a+\delta)Q(a+\delta)Q_1(a+\delta) < 0, \tag{1.11}$$

then Q has at most one real zero in (a, b), counting multiplicities. Moreover, if $Q(\zeta) = 0$ for some $\zeta \in (a, b)$, then $Q(b) \neq 0$ (if Q is finite at b).

Proof. The condition $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (a, b)$ means that Q is finite at every point of (a, b).

If $\zeta \in (a, b)$ and $Q(\zeta) = 0$, then $F(\zeta) = 0$ and (1.8) implies

$$\varphi'(\zeta) = \frac{\varphi(\zeta)\varphi''(\zeta)}{\varphi'(\zeta)}. \tag{1.12}$$

Now we consider F_1. From (1.8) and (1.12) it is easy to derive that

$$F_1(\zeta) = \varphi'(\zeta)\varphi'''(\zeta) - (\varphi''(\zeta))^2 = \frac{\varphi(\zeta)\varphi''(\zeta)\varphi'''(\zeta)}{\varphi'(\zeta)} - (\varphi''(\zeta))^2 = \\ = \frac{\varphi''(\zeta)}{\varphi'(\zeta)}\left[\varphi(\zeta)\varphi'''(\zeta) - \varphi'(\zeta)\varphi''(\zeta)\right] = \frac{\varphi''(\zeta)}{\varphi'(\zeta)}F'(\zeta). \tag{1.13}$$

Since $\varphi'(z) \neq 0, \varphi''(z) \neq 0, Q_1(z) \neq 0$ (and therefore $F_1(z) \neq 0$) in (a, b) by assumption, from (1.13) it follows that ζ is a simple zero of Q. That is, all zeros of Q in (a, b) are simple.

I. Let the inequality (1.10) hold. Assume that, for all sufficiently small $\delta > 0$,

$$\varphi'(a+\delta)\varphi''(a+\delta)Q_1(a+\delta) > 0, \tag{1.14}$$

then $Q(a+\delta) > 0$, that is, $F(a+\delta) > 0$. Therefore, if ζ is the leftmost zero of Q in (a, b), then $F'(\zeta) < 0$. This inequality contradicts (1.13), since

$$\varphi'(z)\varphi''(z)Q_1(z) > 0$$

for $z \in (a, b)$, which follows from (1.14) and from the assumption of the lemma. Consequently, Q cannot have zeros in the interval (a, b) if the inequalities (1.10) and (1.14) hold. In the same way, one can prove that if $\varphi'(a+\delta)\varphi''(a+\delta)Q_1(a+\delta) < 0$ for all sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ and if the inequality (1.10) hold, then $Q(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (a, b)$.

Thus, Q has no zeros in the interval (a, b) if the inequality (1.10) holds. Moreover, it is easy to show that $Q(b) \neq 0$ as well. In fact, if $F(b) = 0$, then, for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\operatorname{sign}\left(\frac{\varphi'(b-\varepsilon)}{\varphi''(b-\varepsilon)}F_1(b-\varepsilon)\right) = \operatorname{sign}(F'(b-\varepsilon)) \tag{1.15}$$

according to (1.13). But if the inequality (1.10) holds, then

$$\operatorname{sign}\left(\frac{\varphi'(b-\varepsilon)}{\varphi''(b-\varepsilon)}F_1(b-\varepsilon)\right) = \operatorname{sign}(F(b-\varepsilon)) \tag{1.16}$$

for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, since $\varphi'(z) \neq 0$, $\varphi''(z) \neq 0$, $Q_1(z) \neq 0$ in the interval (a, b) by assumption and since $Q(z) \neq 0$ in (a, b), which was proved above. So, if the inequality (1.10) holds and if $F(b) = 0$, then from (1.15) and (1.16) we obtain that

$$F(b-\varepsilon)F'(b-\varepsilon) > 0$$

for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. This inequality contradicts the analyticity[2] of the function F. Therefore, if the inequality (1.10) holds and if Q is finite at the point b, then $Q(b) \neq 0$. Thus, the first part of the lemma is proved.

[2]If a function f is analytic at some neighborhood of a real point a and equals zero at this point, then, for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$f(a-\varepsilon)f'(a-\varepsilon) < 0.$$

II. Let the inequality (1.11) hold, then Q can have zeros in (a,b). But it cannot have more than one zero. In fact, if ζ is the leftmost zero of Q in (a,b), then this zero is simple as we proved above. Therefore the following inequality holds for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\varphi'(\zeta+\varepsilon)\varphi''(\zeta+\varepsilon)Q(\zeta+\varepsilon)Q_1(\zeta+\varepsilon) > 0.$$

Consequently, Q has no zeros in $(\zeta, b]$ according to Case I of the lemma. □

Remark 1.5. Lemma 3 is also true if (a,b) is a half-infinite interval, that is, $(a,+\infty)$ or $(-\infty,b)$.

Lemma 3 addresses the case of a finite interval and Remark 1.5 the case of a half-infinite interval. Our next statement concerns the entire real line.

Corollary 3. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}-\mathcal{P}^*$. If $\varphi'(z)\neq 0$, $\varphi''(z)\neq 0$, $Q_1(z)\neq 0$ for $z\in\mathbb{R}$, then $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q)=0$, i.e. Q has no real zeros.*

Proof. The function φ may have real zeros. But by Rolle's theorem, φ has at most one real zero, counting multiplicity, since $\varphi'(z)\neq 0$ for $z\in\mathbb{R}$ by assumption.

If $\varphi(z)\neq 0$ for $z\in\mathbb{R}$, then, by Lemma 3 applied on the real axis, Q has at most one real zero. But by Corollary 2, the number of real zeros of Q is even. Consequently, $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q)=0$.

If φ has one real zero, counting multiplicity, say α, then α is a unique pole of Q. Moreover, since $\varphi''(z)\neq 0$ for $z\in\mathbb{R}$ by assumption, the function $\varphi\varphi''$ changes its sign at α and, therefore, $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) < 0$ in one the intervals $(-\infty,\alpha)$ and $(\alpha,+\infty)$. Consequently, by (1.4), $Q(z)\neq 0$ in one of the intervals $(-\infty,\alpha)$ and $(\alpha,+\infty)$. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $Z_{(-\infty,\alpha]}(Q)=0$. Then according to Lemma 3 and Remark 1.5, we obtain that Q has at most one zero in the interval $(\alpha,+\infty)$. But the number of real zeros of Q is even by Corollary 2, and Q has no zeros in the interval $(-\infty,\alpha]$. Therefore, Q cannot have zeros in the interval $(\alpha,+\infty)$, so $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q)=0$, as required. □

Thus, we have found out that Q has at most one real zero, counting multiplicity, in an interval if the functions φ, φ', φ'' and Q_1 have no real zeros in this interval. Now we study the multiple zeros of Q and its zeros common with some other above-mentioned functions. From (1.4) it follows that all zeros of φ' of multiplicity at least 2 are also zeros of Q and all zeros of φ' of multiplicity at least 3 are multiple zeros of Q. The following lemma provides the information about common zeros of Q and Q_1.

Lemma 4. *Let $\varphi\in\mathcal{L}-\mathcal{P}^*$ and let a and b be real and let $\varphi(z)\neq 0$, $\varphi'(z)\neq 0$, $\varphi''(z)\neq 0$ in the interval (a,b). Suppose that Q_1 has a unique zero $\xi\in(a,b)$ of multiplicity M in (a,b). If $Q(\xi)=0$, then ξ is a zero of Q of multiplicity $M+1$, and $Q(z)\neq 0$ for $z\in(a,\xi)\cup(\xi,b]$.*

Proof. The condition $\varphi(z)\neq 0$ for $z\in(a,b)$ means that Q is finite at every point of (a,b).

By assumption, ξ is a zero of F_1 of multiplicity M and $F(\xi)=0$. First, we prove that ξ is a zero of F of multiplicity $M+1$.

Since $\varphi'(z)\neq 0$ for $z\in(a,b)$ by assumption, from (1.8) it follows that

$$\varphi'(z)=\frac{\varphi(z)\varphi''(z)}{\varphi'(z)}-\frac{F(z)}{\varphi'(z)}.$$

Substituting this expression into the formula (1.8), we obtain

$$F_1(z) = \frac{\varphi(z)\varphi''(z)\varphi'''(z)}{\varphi'(z)} - \frac{\varphi'(z)\varphi''(z)\varphi''(z)}{\varphi'(z)} - \frac{F(z)\varphi'''(z)}{\varphi'(z)} = \\ = \frac{\varphi''(z)}{\varphi'(z)} \cdot F'(z) - \frac{F(z)\varphi'''(z)}{\varphi'(z)},$$

or, equivalently,

$$\frac{\varphi'(z)}{[\varphi''(z)]^2} F_1(z) = \left(\frac{F(z)}{\varphi''(z)}\right)',$$

since $\varphi''(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (a, b)$ by assumption. Differentiating this equality j times with respect to z, we get

$$\left(\frac{\varphi'(z)}{[\varphi''(z)]^2} F_1(z)\right)^{(j)} = \left(\frac{F(z)}{\varphi''(z)}\right)^{(j+1)}. \tag{1.17}$$

From (1.17) it follows that $F^{(j+1)}(\xi) = 0$ if $\varphi'(\xi) \neq 0$, $\varphi''(\xi) \neq 0$, $F_1^{(i)}(\xi) = 0$ and $F^{(i)}(\xi) = 0$, $i = 0, 1, \ldots, j$. Consequently, ξ is a zero of F of multiplicity at least $M + 1$. But by assumptions, the formula (1.17) gives the following equality

$$\varphi'(\xi) F_1^{(M+1)}(\xi) = \varphi''(\xi) F^{(M+2)}(\xi) \neq 0.$$

Hence, ξ is a zero of F of multiplicity exactly $M + 1$. But $\varphi(\xi) \neq 0$ by assumption, therefore, ξ is a zero of Q of multiplicity $M + 1$.

It remains to prove that Q has no zeros in $(a, b]$ except ξ. In fact, consider the interval (a, ξ). According to Lemma 3, Q can have a zero at ξ only if the inequality (1.11) holds and $Q(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (a, \xi)$. Furthermore, the function $\varphi'\varphi''$ does not change its sign at ξ but the function QQ_1 does, since ξ is a zero of QQ_1 of multiplicity $2M + 1$. Thus, for all sufficiently small $\delta > 0$,

$$\varphi'(\xi + \delta)\varphi''(\xi + \delta)Q(\xi + \delta)Q_1(\xi + \delta) > 0, \tag{1.18}$$

since the inequality (1.11) must hold in the interval (a, ξ) by Lemma 3. From (1.18) it follows that Case I of Lemma 3 holds in the interval (ξ, b), so $Q(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (\xi, b]$. □

Remark 1.6. Lemma 4 remains valid if (a, b) is a half-infinite interval, that is, $(a, +\infty)$ or $(-\infty, b)$.

Corollary 4. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ and let $\varphi'(z) \neq 0$, $\varphi''(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$. If Q_1 has only one real zero, then Q has no real zeros, i.e. $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) = 0$.*

Proof. As in Corollary 3, we note that φ has at most one real zero by Rolle's theorem.

Case I. Let $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$ and let ξ be a unique real zero of Q_1. By Corollary 2 (see Remark 1.4), ξ is a zero of Q_1 of even multiplicity $2M$. In this case, the number ξ cannot be zero of Q. In fact, if $Q(\xi) = 0$, then, by Lemma 4 applied on the real axis, ξ is a unique real zero of Q of multiplicity $2M + 1$, that is, $Z_{\{\xi\}}(Q) = Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) = 2M + 1$. This contradicts Corollary 2. So, $Q(\xi) \neq 0$.

Since ξ is a unique real zero of Q_1 of even multiplicity, Q_1 has equal signs in the intervals $(-\infty, \xi)$ and $(\xi, +\infty)$. By Lemma 3 applied to these intervals, Q can have at most one zero in each of the intervals $(-\infty, \xi)$ and $(\xi, +\infty)$. But if Q has a zero in the interval $(-\infty, \xi)$, then $Q(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (\xi, +\infty)$. In fact, if $\zeta \in (-\infty, \xi)$ is a zero of Q, then ζ is simple zero of Q by Lemma 3.

Moreover, $Q(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (\zeta, \xi]$, since (see the proof of Lemma 3), for all sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, we have

$$\varphi'(\zeta+\delta)\varphi''(\zeta+\delta)Q(\zeta+\delta)Q_1(\zeta+\delta) > 0. \tag{1.19}$$

But the functions φ', φ'', Q and Q_1 do not change their signs at ξ, therefore, we have the inequality (1.19) in a small right-sided neighborhood of ξ. Consequently, $Q(z) \neq 0$ in $(\xi, +\infty)$ by Lemma 3.

Thus, if Q has real zeros, then it has at most one zero in one of the intervals $(-\infty, \xi)$ and $(\xi, +\infty)$, that is, $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) \leqslant 1$. Now Corollary 2 implies $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) = 0$.

Case II. If φ has one real zero, counting multiplicity, say α, then α is a unique pole of Q. In this case, as in the proof of Corollary 3, one can show that $Q(z) \neq 0$ in one of the intervals $(-\infty, \alpha)$ and $(\alpha, +\infty)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $Q(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (-\infty, \alpha]$, that is, $Z_{(-\infty,\alpha]}(Q) = 0$. Then by Corollary 2, the number $Z_{(\alpha,+\infty)}(Q)$ is even.

Let ξ be a unique real zero of Q_1 and $\xi \in (-\infty, \alpha]$, then, by Lemma 3 (see Remark 1.5), Q has at most one zero in $(\alpha, +\infty)$. Since $Z_{(\alpha,+\infty)}(Q)$ is an even number, $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) = 0$.

If $\xi \in (\alpha, +\infty)$, then, by the same argument as in Case I, one can show that $Z_{(\alpha,+\infty)}(Q) = 0$. Therefore, $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) = 0$, since $Z_{(-\infty,\alpha]}(Q) = 0$ by assumption. □

We now provide a general bound on the number of real zeros of Q in terms of the number of real zeros of Q_1 in a given interval.

Lemma 5. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ and let a and b be real. If $\varphi(z) \neq 0$, $\varphi'(z) \neq 0$ and $\varphi''(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (a, b)$, then*

$$Z_{(a,b)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(a,b)}(Q_1). \tag{1.20}$$

Proof. If $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) < 0$ in (a, b), then $Q(z) < 0$ for $z \in (a, b)$ by (1.4), that is, $Z_{(a,b)}(Q) = 0$. Therefore, the inequality (1.20) holds automatically in this case.

Let now $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) > 0$ for $z \in (a, b)$. If $Q_1(z) \neq 0$ in (a, b), then, by Lemma 3, Q has at most one real zero, counting multiplicity, in (a, b). Therefore, (1.20) also holds in this case.

If Q_1 has a unique zero ξ in (a, b) and $Q(\xi) \neq 0$, then, by Lemma 3, Q has at most one real zero in each of the intervals (a, ξ) and (ξ, b):

$$Z_{(a,\xi)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(a,\xi)}(Q_1), \tag{1.21}$$

where $Z_{(a,\xi)}(Q_1) = 0$, and

$$Z_{(\xi,b)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\xi,b)}(Q_1), \tag{1.22}$$

where $Z_{(\xi,b)}(Q_1) = 0$. But since $Q(\xi) \neq 0$ and $Q_1(\xi) = 0$, we have

$$0 = Z_{\{\xi\}}(Q) \leqslant -1 + Z_{\{\xi\}}(Q_1). \tag{1.23}$$

Thus, summing the inequalities (1.21)–(1.23), we obtain (1.20).

If Q_1 has a unique zero ξ in (a, b) and $Q(\xi) = 0$, then, by Lemma 4, we have

$$Z_{\{\xi\}}(Q) = 1 + Z_{\{\xi\}}(Q_1),$$

and $Q(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (a, \xi) \cup (\xi, b)$. Therefore, the inequality (1.20) is also true in this case.

Now, let Q_1 have exactly $r \geqslant 2$ *distinct* real zeros, say $\xi_1 < \xi_2 < \ldots < \xi_r$, in the interval (a, b). These zeros divide (a, b) into $r + 1$ subintervals. If, for some number i, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$, $Q(\xi_i) \neq 0$ and $Q(\xi_{i-1}) \neq 0$ (if $i \neq 1$), then, by Lemma 3, Q has *at most* one real zero, counting multiplicity, in $(\xi_{i-1}, \xi_i]$ ($\xi_0 \stackrel{def}{=} a$). But Q_1 has *at least* one real zero in $(\xi_{i-1}, \xi_i]$, counting multiplicities (at the point ξ_i). Consequently,

$$Z_{(\xi_{i-1},\xi_i]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\xi_{i-1},\xi_i]}(Q_1) \tag{1.24}$$

If, for some number i, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r-1$, $Q(\xi_i) = 0$ and ξ_i is a zero of Q_1 of multiplicity M, then, by Lemma 4, Q has only one zero ξ_i of multiplicity $M+1$ in $(\xi_{i-1}, \xi_{i+1}]$. But in the interval $(\xi_{i-1}, \xi_{i+1}]$, Q_1 has *at least* $M + 1$ real zeros, counting multiplicities (namely, ξ_i which is a zero of multiplicity M, and ξ_{i+1}). Therefore, in this case, the following inequality holds

$$Z_{(\xi_{i-1},\xi_{i+1}]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\xi_{i-1},\xi_{i+1}]}(Q_1) \tag{1.25}$$

Thus, if $Q(\xi_r) \neq 0$, then from (1.24)–(1.25) it follows that

$$Z_{(a,\xi_r]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(a,\xi_r]}(Q_1). \tag{1.26}$$

But by Lemma 3, Q has *at most* one real zero, counting multiplicity, in the interval (ξ_r, b). Consequently, if $Q(\xi_r) \neq 0$, then the inequality (1.20) is valid.

If $Q(\xi_r) = 0$, then, by Lemma 4, $Q(\xi_{r-1}) \neq 0$ (otherwise, ξ_r cannot be a zero of Q) and from (1.24)–(1.25) it follows that

$$Z_{(a,\xi_{r-1}]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\xi_a,\xi_{r-1}]}(Q_1). \tag{1.27}$$

Now Lemma 4 implies

$$Z_{(\xi_{r-1},b)}(Q) = 1 + Z_{(\xi_{r-1},b)}(Q_1), \tag{1.28}$$

therefore, the inequality (1.20) follows from (1.27)–(1.28). □

Remark 1.7. Lemma 5 is also true if (a, b) is a half-infinite interval, that is, $(a, +\infty)$ or $(-\infty, b)$ (see Remarks 1.5 and 1.6).

We are now in a position to establish an analogous relation between the number of real zeros of Q and Q_1 on the real line.

Corollary 5. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$. If $\varphi'(z) \neq 0$, $\varphi''(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$, then*

$$0 \leqslant Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) \leqslant Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_1). \tag{1.29}$$

Proof. As in Corollary 3, we note that φ has at most one real zero, counting multiplicity, by Rolle's theorem.

Case I. Let $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Then we can apply Lemma 5 (see also Corollaries 3 and 4) on the real axis to obtain

$$0 \leqslant Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_1), \tag{1.30}$$

that is equivalent to (1.29), since the numbers $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q)$ and $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_1)$ are both even by Corollary 2 and Remark 1.4.

Case II. If φ has one real zero, counting multiplicity, say α, then α is a unique pole of Q. In this case, as in the proof of Corollary 3, one can show that $Q(z) \neq 0$ in one of the intervals $(-\infty, \alpha)$

and $(\alpha, +\infty)$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $Q(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (-\infty, \alpha]$. Then by Corollary 2, the number $Z_{(\alpha,+\infty)}(Q)$ is even and the following inequality holds

$$0 = Z_{(-\infty,\alpha]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(-\infty,\alpha]}(Q_1). \tag{1.31}$$

By Lemma 5 (see Remarks 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7), we obtain

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\alpha,+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\alpha,+\infty)}(Q_1). \tag{1.32}$$

The inequalities (1.31)–(1.32) imply (1.30), which is equivalent to (1.29) as we showed above. □

We now embark on a more detailed analysis of the zeros of φ, φ', and φ''. For convenience, we use α_j to denote the zeros of φ, β_j to denote the zeros of φ', and γ_j to denote the zeros of φ''. We have already used this convention in Lemma 1, Lemma 2 and their Corollaries. In the following lemma, we consider an arbitrary pair of zeros of φ'', so we denote them by $\gamma^{(1)}$, $\gamma^{(2)}$.

Lemma 6. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ and let $\gamma^{(1)}$ and $\gamma^{(2)}$, $\gamma^{(1)} < \gamma^{(2)}$, be real zeros of φ'' such that $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ and $\varphi'(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in [\gamma^{(1)}, \gamma^{(2)}]$ and suppose that φ'' has exactly $q \geqslant 2$ zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval $[\gamma^{(1)}, \gamma^{(2)}]$. Then Q has an even number of zeros in $[\gamma^{(1)}, \gamma^{(2)}]$ and one of the following hold:*

I. *If q is an odd number, then*

$$0 \leqslant Z_{[\gamma^{(1)},\gamma^{(2)}]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{[\gamma^{(1)},\gamma^{(2)}]}(Q_1). \tag{1.33}$$

II. *If q is an even number and $\varphi(\gamma^{(1)} - \varepsilon)\varphi''(\gamma^{(1)} - \varepsilon) > 0$ for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, then*

$$0 \leqslant Z_{[\gamma^{(1)},\gamma^{(2)}]}(Q) \leqslant -1 + Z_{[\gamma^{(1)},\gamma^{(2)}]}(Q_1). \tag{1.34}$$

III. *If q is an even number and $\varphi(\gamma^{(1)} - \varepsilon)\varphi''(\gamma^{(1)} - \varepsilon) < 0$ for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, then*

$$0 \leqslant Z_{[\gamma^{(1)},\gamma^{(2)}]}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{[\gamma^{(1)},\gamma^{(2)}]}(Q_1). \tag{1.35}$$

Proof. We assume that φ'' has exactly $r \leqslant q$ *distinct* zeros in the interval $[\gamma^{(1)}, \gamma^{(2)}]$, say $\gamma^{(1)} = \gamma_1 < \gamma_2 < \ldots < \gamma_{r-1} < \gamma_r = \gamma^{(2)}$. Below in the proof, we denote the interval $[\gamma^{(1)}, \gamma^{(2)}]$ by $[\gamma_1, \gamma_r]$.

From (1.4) it follows that

$$Q(\gamma_i) = -\frac{(\varphi'(\gamma_i))^2}{(\varphi(\gamma_i))^2} < 0, \tag{1.36}$$

since $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ and $\varphi'(z) \neq 0$ in $[\gamma_1, \gamma_r]$ by assumption. Thus, Q has an even number of zeros in the interval $[\gamma_1, \gamma_r]$.

I. Let q be an odd number.

If $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) \leqslant 0$ for $z \in [\gamma_1, \gamma_r]$, then, by (1.4), we have the inequalities

$$0 = Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_r]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_r]}(Q_1),$$

which are exactly (1.33).

If, for some i, $2 \leqslant i \leqslant r$, $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) > 0$ in the interval (γ_{i-1}, γ_i), then, by Lemma 5, we have

$$Z_{(\gamma_{i-1},\gamma_i)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\gamma_{i-1},\gamma_i)}(Q_1). \tag{1.37}$$

Moreover, there can be only two possibilities:

I.1. If the number γ_i is a zero of φ'' of *even* multiplicity (at least two), then, according to (1.6), γ_i is a zero of Q_1 of multiplicity *at least* one, but $Q(\gamma_i) \neq 0$ by (1.36). From these facts and from the inequality (1.37) we obtain

$$Z_{(\gamma_{i-1},\gamma_i]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\gamma_{i-1},\gamma_i]}(Q_1). \tag{1.38}$$

For the sequel, we notice that, in this case, φ'' has an *even* number of zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval $(\gamma_{i-1}, \gamma_i]$.

I.2. If the number γ_i, $i < r$, is a zero of φ'' of *odd* multiplicity (at least one), then $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z)$ is nonpositive in $[\gamma_i, \gamma_{i+1}]$, so $Q(z) \neq 0$ in this interval by (1.4). But Q_1 has an odd number (at least one) of real zeros in (γ_i, γ_{i+1}) according to Lemma 1 applied to Q_1, therefore,

$$0 = Z_{(\gamma_i,\gamma_{i+1}]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\gamma_i,\gamma_{i+1}]}(Q_1) - 1. \tag{1.39}$$

This inequality and the inequality (1.37) imply

$$Z_{(\gamma_{i-1},\gamma_{i+1}]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\gamma_{i-1},\gamma_{i+1}]}(Q_1). \tag{1.40}$$

Suppose that γ_j, $i+1 \leqslant j \leqslant r$, is the next zero of φ'' of odd multiplicity, i.e., we assume that the multiplicity of each of $\gamma_{i+1}, \ldots, \gamma_{j-1}$ is even, while the multiplicity of γ_j is odd. Then we have $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) \leqslant 0$ and, therefore, $Q(z) < 0$ for $z \in (\gamma_{i+1}, \gamma_j]$ according to (1.4). But by Lemma 1 applied to Q_1 on the intervals $(\gamma_{i+1}, \gamma_{i+2}), \ldots, (\gamma_{j-1}, \gamma_j)$, Q_1 has *at least* $j - i - 1$ zeros in $(\gamma_{i+1}, \gamma_j]$. This fact and the inequality (1.40) imply

$$Z_{(\gamma_{i-1},\gamma_j]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\gamma_{i-1},\gamma_j]}(Q_1). \tag{1.41}$$

As well as in Case I.1, we notice that φ'' has an *even* number of zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval $(\gamma_{i-1}, \gamma_j]$. It follows from the fact that γ_i and γ_j are zeros of φ'' of odd multiplicities and $\gamma_{i+1}, \ldots, \gamma_{j-1}$ are zeros of φ'' of even multiplicities.

Let l, $1 \leqslant l \leqslant r-1$, be an integer such that $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z)$ is nonpositive in the interval $[\gamma_1, \gamma_l]$ and positive in the interval (γ_l, γ_{l+1}). Then by (1.4), $Q(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in [\gamma_1, \gamma_l]$, and we have the following inequality

$$0 = Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_l]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_l]}(Q_1), \tag{1.42}$$

since Q_1 has at least $l - 1\,(\geqslant 0)$ zeros in $[\gamma_1, \gamma_l]$ by Lemma 1 applied to Q_1 on the intervals $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2), \ldots, (\gamma_{l-1}, \gamma_l)$.

If γ_r is a zero of φ'' of even multiplicity or if $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) < 0$ in (γ_{r-1}, γ_r), then the interval $(\gamma_l, \gamma_r]$ consists only of the subintervals described in Cases I.1 and I.2. Consequently, from the inequalities (1.38), (1.41), (1.42) we obtain

$$Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_r]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_r]}(Q_1). \tag{1.43}$$

Let γ_r be a zero of φ'' of odd multiplicity and let $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) > 0$ in (γ_{r-1}, γ_r) and let $l \geqslant 2$. Then the interval $(\gamma_l, \gamma_{r-1}]$ consists only of subintervals described in Cases I.1 and I.2 and, therefore,

$$Z_{(\gamma_l,\gamma_{r-1}]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\gamma_l,\gamma_{r-1}]}(Q_1). \tag{1.44}$$

Moreover, since $l \geqslant 2$ by assumption, we have $Q(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in [\gamma_1, \gamma_l]$, but Q_1 has *at least* one zero in $[\gamma_1, \gamma_l]$ as we mentioned above. Consequently, in this case, we can improve the inequality (1.42) to the following one:

$$0 = Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_l]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_l]}(Q_1) - 1. \tag{1.45}$$

Furthermore, we have

$$Z_{(\gamma_{r-1},\gamma_r]}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\gamma_{r-1},\gamma_r]}(Q_1) \tag{1.46}$$

by Lemma 5 and by the fact that $Q(\gamma_r) \neq 0$ (see (1.36)). Summing the inequalities (1.44)–(1.46), we again obtain (1.43).

At last, let γ_r also be a zero of φ'' of odd multiplicity and let $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) > 0$ in (γ_{r-1}, γ_r), but let $l = 1$. In this case, by the same reasoning as above, the inequalities (1.44) (for $l = 1$) and (1.46) hold. Recalling the final remarks in Cases I.1 and I.2, we conclude that φ'' has an *even* number of zeros in the interval $(\gamma_1, \gamma_{r-1}]$. Since φ'' has an odd number q of zeros in $[\gamma_1, \gamma_r]$ and γ_r is a zero of φ'' of odd multiplicity by assumption, γ_1 must be a zero of φ'' of even multiplicity. But (1.6) shows that every zero of φ'' of even multiplicity is a zero of Q_1 of odd multiplicity. Consequently, γ_1 is a zero of Q_1 of multiplicity *at least* one, and we have

$$0 = Z_{\{\gamma_1\}}(Q) \leqslant Z_{\{\gamma_1\}}(Q_1) - 1. \tag{1.47}$$

Summing the inequalities (1.44), (1.44) and (1.47), we also obtain the inequality (1.43).

Thus, the number of zeros of Q in the interval $[\gamma_1, \gamma_r]$ does not exceed the number of zeros of Q_1 in this interval. This implies the validity of the inequalities (1.33) where the lower bound cannot be improved, since the number of zeros of Q in the interval $[\gamma_1, \gamma_r]$ is even as we showed above (see (1.36)).

II. Now let $q = 2M$ and $\varphi(\gamma_1 - \varepsilon)\varphi''(\gamma_1 - \varepsilon) > 0$ for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$.

At first, we assume that one of the γ_i, $i = 1, \ldots, r$, is a zero of φ'' of odd multiplicity. Let γ_j, $1 \leqslant j \leqslant r-1$, be[3] the closest to γ_1 (possibly γ_1 itself) zero of φ'' of odd multiplicity. Since φ'' has an odd number of zeros in the interval $[\gamma_1, \gamma_j]$, φ'' has different signs in the interval (γ_j, γ_{j+1}) and in the left-sided neighborhood of γ_1, where $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z)$ is positive by assumption. Consequently, $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z)$ is negative in (γ_j, γ_{j+1}), because $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in [\gamma_1, \gamma_r]$ by assumption. Hence, according to (1.4), $Q(z) \neq 0$ in the interval (γ_j, γ_{j+1}), and we have

$$0 = Z_{(\gamma_j,\gamma_{j+1})}(Q) \leqslant -1 + Z_{(\gamma_j,\gamma_{j+1})}(Q_1), \tag{1.48}$$

since Q_1 has an odd number (at least one) of zeros, counting multiplicities, in (γ_j, γ_{j+1}) by Lemma 1 applied to Q_1 on the interval (γ_j, γ_{j+1}). On the other hand, inasmuch as φ'' has an odd number of zeros, counting multiplicities, in both the intervals $[\gamma_1, \gamma_j]$ and $[\gamma_{j+1}, \gamma_r]$, it follows from Case I that[4]

$$0 \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_j]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_j]}(Q_1), \tag{1.49}$$

[3]Since φ'' has an *even* number of real zeros in $[\gamma_1, \gamma_r]$ by assumption, there is always *even* number of zeros of φ'' of odd multiplicities in $[\gamma_1, \gamma_r]$. Thus, γ_r cannot be the closest to γ_1 (and thereby the only) zero of φ'' of odd multiplicity.

[4]If $\gamma_j = \gamma_1$ and γ_1 is a zero of φ'' of multiplicity $K > 1$, then γ_1 is a zero of Q_1 of multiplicity $K - 1$ according to (1.6). If γ_1 is a simple zero of φ'', then γ_1 is not a zero of Q_1. In both cases, (1.49) reduces to the following inequality

$$0 = Z_{\{\gamma_1\}}(Q) \leqslant Z_{\{\gamma_1\}}(Q_1).$$

$$0 \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_{j+1},\gamma_r]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_{j+1},\gamma_r]}(Q_1). \tag{1.50}$$

The inequalities (1.48)–(1.50) together give the inequality (1.34).

Now we assume that all γ_i, $i = 1, \dots, r$, are zeros of φ'' of even multiplicities. Therefore,

$$1 \leqslant r \leqslant M \tag{1.51}$$

and φ'' has equal signs in all intervals (γ_i, γ_{i+1}), $i = 1, \dots, r-1$. Since $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z)$ is positive in a small left-sided neighborhood of γ_1 by assumption, it is positive in each of the intervals (γ_i, γ_{i+1}), $i = 1, \dots, r-1$. Thus, we have

$$0 \leqslant Z_{X_1}(Q) \leqslant r - 1 + Z_{X_1}(Q_1) \leqslant M - 1 + Z_{X_1}(Q_1), \tag{1.52}$$

where $X_1 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{r-1}(\gamma_i, \gamma_{i+1})$. Indeed, since $Q(\gamma_i) < 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$ (see (1.36)), Q has an even number of zeros in each of the interval (γ_i, γ_{i+1}). This fact implies the lower estimate in (1.52). The upper bound follows from Lemma 5 applied to the intervals (γ_i, γ_{i+1}) and from (1.51). Further, Q_1 has exactly $2M - r$ zeros, counting multiplicities, among the points $X_2 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{r}\{\gamma_i\}$. Consequently, by (1.51), we have

$$Z_{X_2}(Q_1) = 2M - r \geqslant M. \tag{1.53}$$

Now we note that $[\gamma_1, \gamma_r] = X_1 \bigcup X_2$ and $Z_{X_2}(Q) = 0$. Therefore, from (1.52)–(1.53) it follows that

$$0 \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_r]}(Q) = Z_{X_1}(Q) \leqslant M - 1 + Z_{X_1}(Q_1) =$$

$$= M - 1 + Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_r]}(Q_1) - Z_{X_2}(Q_1) \leqslant -1 + Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_r]}(Q_1),$$

where the lower bound cannot be improved, since Q has an even number of zeros in the interval $[\gamma_1, \gamma_r]$ as we showed above (see (1.36)). So, the inequalities (1.34) are also valid in this case.

III. At last, let $q = 2M$ and let

$$\varphi(\gamma_1 - \varepsilon)\varphi''(\gamma_1 - \varepsilon) < 0 \tag{1.54}$$

for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. If φ'' has zeros of odd multiplicities in the interval $[\gamma_1, \gamma_r]$, then this case differs from Case II only by the sign of the function $\varphi\varphi''$ in the interval (γ_j, γ_{j+1}), where γ_j is the closest to γ_1 (possibly γ_1 itself) zero of φ'' of odd multiplicity. Thus, now we have $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) > 0$ in (γ_j, γ_{j+1}), since φ'' has an odd number of zeros in $[\gamma_1, \gamma_j]$ (see (1.54)). Therefore, instead of the inequalities (1.48) of Case II, we have

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\gamma_j,\gamma_{j+1})}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\gamma_j,\gamma_{j+1})}(Q_1) \tag{1.55}$$

by Lemma 5. As in Cases I and II, the lower bound follows from (1.36). The inequalities (1.49), (1.50) and (1.55) imply (1.35).

If all γ_i, $i = 1, \dots, r$, are zeros of φ'' of even multiplicities, then (1.54) implies $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) \leqslant 0$ in $[\gamma_1, \gamma_r]$, so we have

$$0 = Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_r]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_r]}(Q_1), \tag{1.56}$$

which also gives (1.35). □

Further, we derive a very useful bound on the number of real zeros of Q in terms of the number of real zeros of Q_1 between two consecutive zeros of φ'.

Corollary 6. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$. If β_1 and β_2, $\beta_1 < \beta_2$, are consecutive real zeros of φ' and $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (\beta_1, \beta_2)$, then*

$$1 \leqslant Z_{(\beta_1,\beta_2)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\beta_1,\beta_2)}(Q_1). \tag{1.57}$$

Proof. By Lemma 1, Q has an odd number of zeros in the interval (β_1, β_2), therefore,

$$1 \leqslant Z_{(\beta_1,\beta_2)}(Q). \tag{1.58}$$

According to Rolle's theorem, φ'' has an odd number of real zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval (β_1, β_2). Let γ_S and γ_L be the smallest and the largest zeros of φ'' in the (β_1, β_2). If $\gamma_S < \gamma_L$, then from Case I of Lemma 6 it follows that

$$0 \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_S,\gamma_L]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_S,\gamma_L]}(Q_1). \tag{1.59}$$

If $\gamma_S = \gamma_L$, then (see (1.36))

$$0 = Z_{\{\gamma_S\}}(Q) \leqslant Z_{\{\gamma_S\}}(Q_1). \tag{1.60}$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that the function $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z)$ is positive in the interval (β_1, γ_S). Then $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) < 0$ for $z \in (\gamma_L, \beta_2)$, since φ'' has an odd number of zeros in $[\gamma_S, \gamma_L]$ and $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ in (β_1, β_2) by assumption. Thus, by (1.4), we have

$$0 = Z_{(\gamma_L,\beta_2)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\gamma_L,\beta_2)}(Q_1). \tag{1.61}$$

We cannot improve this inequality, since Q_1 has an even number of zeros in (γ_L, β_2) by Lemma 1 applied to Q_1 on the interval (γ_L, β_2). By Lemma 5,

$$Z_{(\beta_1,\gamma_S)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\beta_1,\gamma_S)}(Q_1). \tag{1.62}$$

The inequalities (1.58)–(1.62) imply (1.57). □

We now address the case when φ and φ' have no real zeros. In this case, the estimates (1.34)–(1.35) can be improved.

Corollary 7. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ and let $\varphi(z) \neq 0$, $\varphi'(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the inequalities* (1.29) *hold for φ.*

Proof. At first, we note that φ'' cannot have an odd number of real zeros, counting multiplicities, if $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$. In fact, since $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ has no real zeros by assumption, $\varphi(z) = e^{q(z)}p(z)$, where q is a real polynomial of degree at most two and p is a real polynomial with no real zeros. Therefore, $\deg p$ is even. Since φ'' has exactly $\deg p + 2\deg q - 2$ zeros, φ'' has an even number of real zeros, counting multiplicities, or has no real zeros.

If $\varphi''(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$, then the inequalities (1.29) follow from Corollary 5.

Let φ'' have an even number of real zeros, counting multiplicities, say $\gamma_1 \leqslant \gamma_2 \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \gamma_{2r}$, $r \geqslant 1$. If $\gamma_1 = \gamma_{2r}$, then γ_1 is a unique real zero of φ'' and its multiplicity is even. Consequently, γ_1 is a zero of Q_1, according to (1.6). Therefore, the inequality (1.36) implies

$$0 = Z_{\{\gamma_1\}}(Q) \leqslant -1 + Z_{\{\gamma_1\}}(Q_1). \tag{1.63}$$

Since $Q(z)$ is negative when $z = \gamma_1$ (see (1.36)) and when $z \to \pm\infty$, Q has an even number of zeros in each of the intervals $(-\infty, \gamma_1)$ and $(\gamma_1, +\infty)$. Then by Lemma 5 and Remark 1.7, the following inequalities hold

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(-\infty,\gamma_1)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(-\infty,\gamma_1)}(Q_1), \tag{1.64}$$
$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\gamma_1,+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\gamma_1,+\infty)}(Q_1).$$

Together with (1.63), these inequalities imply (1.30), which is equivalent to (1.29), since the numbers $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q)$ and $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_1)$ are both even by Corollary 2 and Remark 1.4.

Let $\gamma_1 < \gamma_{2r}$ and let $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) > 0$ for $z \in (-\infty, \gamma_1)$. Then $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) > 0$ for $z \in (\gamma_{2r}, +\infty)$, since φ'' has equal signs in the intervals $(-\infty, \gamma_1)$ and $(\gamma_{2r}, +\infty)$ and $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$ by assumption. By Lemma 5 and Remark 1.7, the inequalities (1.64) hold and

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\gamma_{2r},+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\gamma_{2r},+\infty)}(Q_1). \tag{1.65}$$

Case II of Lemma 6 implies

$$0 \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_{2r}]}(Q) \leqslant -1 + Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_{2r}]}(Q_1). \tag{1.66}$$

Now from (1.64)–(1.66) we obtain the inequalities (1.30), which are equivalent to (1.29) as we mentioned above.

If $\gamma_1 < \gamma_{2r}$ and $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) < 0$ for $z \in (-\infty, \gamma_1)$, then $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) < 0$ for $z \in (\gamma_{2r}, +\infty)$. Therefore, by (1.4), the following inequalities hold

$$0 = Z_{(-\infty,\gamma_1)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(-\infty,\gamma_1)}(Q_1), \tag{1.67}$$

$$0 = Z_{(\gamma_{2r},+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\gamma_{2r},+\infty)}(Q_1). \tag{1.68}$$

From Case III of Lemma 6 it follows that the inequalities (1.35) hold in the interval $[\gamma_1, \gamma_{2r}]$ and together with (1.67)–(1.68), they imply (1.30), which is equivalent to (1.29). □

We now analyze the relation between the number of real zeros of Q and the number of real zeros of Q_1 in an interval adjacent to a zero of φ. This analysis justifies the introduction of *property A* (Definition 3).

Lemma 7. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ and let β be a real zero of φ' and let $\alpha > \beta$ be a real zero of φ such that $\varphi'(z) \neq 0$ and $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (\beta, \alpha)$.*

I. *If Q_1 has an even number of zeros in the interval (β, α), then*

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\beta,\alpha)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\beta,\alpha)}(Q_1). \tag{1.69}$$

II. *If Q_1 has an odd number of zeros in the interval (β, α), then*

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\beta,\alpha)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\beta,\alpha)}(Q_1). \tag{1.70}$$

Proof. According to Lemma 1, Q has an even number of zeros in the interval (β, α). In particular, Q can have no zeros in this interval. Thus, the lower bounds for $Z_{(\beta_1,\alpha)}(Q)$ in (1.69) and in (1.70) are valid and cannot be improved.

I. Let Q_1 have an even number of zeros in (β_1, α) (or have no zeros at all in this interval).

I.1. At first, we assume that φ'' has an even number of zeros, counting multiplicities, in (β,α), say $\beta<\gamma_1\leqslant\ldots\leqslant\gamma_{2M}<\alpha$, where $M\geqslant 0$. It is easy to see that, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon>0$, we have the following inequality

$$\varphi(\beta+\varepsilon)\varphi''(\beta+\varepsilon)<0. \tag{1.71}$$

In fact, if $\varphi(z)$ is positive (negative) in (β_1,α), then it is decreasing (increasing), since $\varphi(\alpha)=0$. Consequently, $\varphi(z)\varphi'(z)<0$ in the interval (β_1,α). By the similar reason, we have $\varphi'(\beta_1+\varepsilon)\varphi''(\beta_1+\varepsilon)>0$ for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon>0$. Thus, the inequality (1.71) is true.

Let φ'' have zeros in the interval (β,α), that is, let $M>0$, then from (1.71) it follows that $Q(z)\neq 0$ for $z\in(\beta,\gamma_1)$ (see (1.4)), so we have

$$0=Z_{(\beta,\gamma_1)}(Q)\leqslant Z_{(\beta,\gamma_1)}(Q_1). \tag{1.72}$$

If $\gamma_1<\gamma_{2M}$, then by (1.71) and Case III of Lemma 6, we obtain

$$0\leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_{2M}]}(Q)\leqslant 1+Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_{2M}]}(Q_1). \tag{1.73}$$

Moreover, from (1.71) it also follows that $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z)<0$ in (γ_{2M},α), since φ'' has equal signs in the intervals (β,γ_1) and (γ_{2M},α). Therefore,

$$0=Z_{(\gamma_{2M},\alpha)}(Q)\leqslant Z_{(\gamma_{2M},\alpha)}(Q_1). \tag{1.74}$$

Let $\gamma_1=\gamma_{2M}$, that is, let γ_1 be a unique zero of φ'' of multiplicity $2M$ in (β,α). Since $Z_{\{\gamma_1\}}(Q)=0$ by (1.36) and Q_1 has a zero of multiplicity $2M-1$ at the point γ_1 (see (1.6)), we obtain the following inequality

$$0=Z_{\{\gamma_1\}}(Q)\leqslant 1+Z_{\{\gamma_1\}}(Q_1)=2M. \tag{1.75}$$

Likewise, the inequality (1.74) holds for the same reasoning as in the case $\gamma_1<\gamma_{2M}$.

Thus, the inequalities (1.72)–(1.75) imply

$$0\leqslant Z_{(\beta,\alpha)}(Q)\leqslant 1+Z_{(\beta,\alpha)}(Q_1), \tag{1.76}$$

which is equivalent to (1.69), since the number $Z_{(\beta,\alpha)}(Q)$ is even by Lemma 1 and $Z_{(\beta,\alpha)}(Q_1)$ is an even number by assumption.

At last, let $\varphi''(z)\neq 0$ for $z\in(\beta,\alpha)$. Then from (1.71) and (1.4) it follows that

$$0=Z_{(\beta,\alpha)}(Q)\leqslant Z_{(\beta,\alpha)}(Q_1), \tag{1.77}$$

which is exactly (1.69).

Since Q_1 has an even number of zeros in the interval (β,γ_1) by Lemma 1 and Q_1 also has an even number of zeros in (β,α) by assumption, Q_1 can have no zeros in these intervals[5]. Consequently, the inequalities (1.72) and (1.77) cannot be improved.

[5]The function Q_1 can have no zeros in (β,α) only if φ'' has no zeros in this interval. Otherwise, Q_1 has zeros in (β,α) by Lemma 1 applied to Q_1, since φ'' has an even number of zeros in this interval by assumption.

I.2. Now we assume that φ'' has an odd number of zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval (β, α), say $\beta < \gamma_1 \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \gamma_{2M+1} < \alpha$, where $M \geqslant 0$. As in Case I.1, the inequalities (1.71) and (1.72) hold.

If $\gamma_1 < \gamma_{2M+1}$, then from Case I of Lemma 6 it follows that

$$0 \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1, \gamma_{2M+1}]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1, \gamma_{2M+1}]}(Q_1), \tag{1.78}$$

If $\gamma_1 = \gamma_{2M+1}$, that is, γ_1 is a unique zero of φ'' of multiplicity $2M+1$ in the interval (β, α), then $Z_{\{\gamma_1\}}(Q) = 0$ (see (1.36)) and Q_1 has a zero of multiplicity $2M$ at the point γ_1 (see (1.6)). Therefore, we have

$$0 = Z_{\{\gamma_1\}}(Q) \leqslant Z_{\{\gamma_1\}}(Q_1) = 2M. \tag{1.79}$$

We note that $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) > 0$ in (γ_{2M+1}, α), since φ'' has different signs in intervals (β, γ_1) and (γ_{2M+1}, α) and the inequality (1.71) holds. Therefore, by Lemma 5, we have

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\gamma_{2M+1}, \alpha)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\gamma_{2M+1}, \alpha)}(Q_1). \tag{1.80}$$

Since Q has an even number of zeros, counting multiplicities, in each of the intervals (β, α) and (β, γ_1) (the second interval contains no zeros at all), as well as in $(\gamma_1, \gamma_{2M+1})$ by Lemmata 1 and 6, Q has an even number of zeros in (γ_{2M+1}, α). Therefore, the number $Z_{(\gamma_{2M+1}, \alpha)}(Q)$ can be equal to zero, and we cannot improve the lower bound in (1.80).

Thus, from (1.72), (1.78)–(1.80) we obtain the inequalities (1.76) again. As above, these inequalities are equivalent to (1.69), since the number $Z_{(\beta_1, \alpha)}(Q)$ is even by Lemma 1 and $Z_{(\beta_1, \alpha)}(Q_1)$ is an even number by assumption.

II. If Q_1 has an odd number of zeros in (β, α), then, by the same argument as in Case I, we obtain the inequalities (1.76), which coincide with the inequalities (1.70). But unlike in Case I, these inequalities cannot be improved, since $Z_{(\beta, \alpha)}(Q_1)$ is odd by assumption. □

Remark 1.8. Lemma 7 is true if $\beta = -\infty$ and $\varphi(z) \neq 0$, $\varphi'(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (-\infty, \alpha)$ (see Remark 1.7). Lemma 7 is also valid in the case when $\beta > \alpha$ or in the interval $(\alpha, +\infty)$.

Remark 1.9. Recently S. Edwards [8] found the following example of the polynomial, for which the equality holds in (1.70). The polynomial

$$p(z) = z(z^2 - 1/4)(z^2 + 1)^{25}$$

has 3 real zeros: $\pm\dfrac{1}{2}$ and 0. Its derivative $p'(z)$ has only two real zeros: $\pm\beta$, where

$$\beta = \frac{\sqrt{4134 + 106\sqrt{2369}}}{212} \approx 0.4547246059.$$

In the interval $(-\beta, \beta)$, the polynomial p has only one simple zero $\alpha = 0$. Straightforward computation shows that, in this case, we have $Z_{(-\beta, \alpha)}(Q(z)) = Z_{(\alpha, \beta)}(Q(z)) = 2$ and $Z_{(-\beta, \alpha)}(Q_1(z)) = Z_{(\alpha, \beta)}(Q_1(z)) = 1$, where $Q(z) = (p'(z)/p(z))'$ and $Q_1(z) = (p''(z)/p'(z))'$. Therefore, for the polynomial p, the inequalities (1.70) have the form

$$Z_{(-\beta, \alpha)}(Q(z)) = Z_{(-\beta, \alpha)}(Q_1(z)) + 1,$$

$$Z_{(\alpha,\beta)}(Q_1(z)) = Z_{(\alpha,\beta)}(Q_1(z)) + 1.$$

This example shows that the upper bound in (1.70) cannot be improved. We also note that, in this case, $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(p) = 50$, $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(p') = 50$, $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) = 4$ and $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_1) = 2$. So, the polynomial p does not enjoy the inequalities (1.7) of Theorem 2, so necessarily does not possess *property A*.

For functions with *property A*, Lemma 7 has the following form.

Corollary 8. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ and let β_1 and β_2, $\beta_1 < \beta_2$, be real zeros of φ' and let φ have a unique real zero α in the interval (β_1, β_2) such that $\varphi'(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in (\beta_1, \alpha) \cup (\alpha, \beta_2)$. If φ possesses property A at its zero α, then*

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\beta_1,\beta_2)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\beta_1,\beta_2)}(Q_1). \tag{1.81}$$

Proof. We consider two situations: the number α is a zero of Q_1 of even multiplicity (possibly not a zero of Q_1) and α is a zero of Q_1 of an odd multiplicity.

Case I. Let the number α be a zero of Q_1 of an even multiplicity, including the situation $Q_1(\alpha) \neq 0$. By the same method as in the proof of Corollary 2, one can show that Q_1 has an even number of zeros between two consecutive zeros of φ', therefore, Q_1 has an even number of zeros in the interval (β_1, β_2). Thus, there can be only two possibilities:

I.1. The function Q_1 has an even number of zeros in each of the intervals (β_1, α) and (α, β_2). Then the inequalities (1.81) follow[6] from the fact that $Z_{\{\alpha\}}(Q) \neq 0$ and from the inequalities (1.69), which hold in this case according to Lemma 7 (see also Remark 1.8).

I.2. The function Q_1 has an odd number of zeros in each of the intervals (β_1, α) and (α, β_2). Then Lemma 7 and Remark 1.8 provide the validity of the inequalities (1.70) in each of the intervals (β_1, α) and (α, β_2):

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\beta_1,\alpha)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\beta_1,\alpha)}(Q_1), \tag{1.82}$$

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\alpha,\beta_2)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\alpha,\beta_2)}(Q_1). \tag{1.83}$$

Since φ possesses property A at α, we have $Q(z) \neq 0$ in at least one of the intervals (β_1, α) and (α, β_2).

If $Q(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (\beta_1, \alpha)$, then $Z_{(\beta_1,\alpha)}(Q) = 0$. Since Q_1 has an odd number of zeros in the interval (β_1, α) (hence at least one) by assumption, the inequality (1.82) can be improved to yield

$$0 = Z_{(\beta_1,\alpha)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\beta_1,\alpha)}(Q_1) - 1. \tag{1.84}$$

Together with (1.83) and the fact that $Z_{\{\alpha\}}(Q) \neq 0$, this inequality gives (1.81).

If $Q(z) \neq 0$ in the interval (α, β_2), then (1.81) can be proved analogously.

Case II. Let the number α be a zero of Q_1 of odd multiplicity (hence at least one).

By assumption, φ possesses *property A*. At first, we assume that $Q(z) \neq 0$ in the interval (β_1, α). As we mentioned in Case I, Q_1 has an even number of zeros in the interval (β_1, β_2), so there can be only the following two situations:

[6] In this case, we do not use the fact that φ possesses property A at its zero α.

II.1. The function Q_1 has an odd number of zeros in the interval (β_1, α) and it has an even number of zeros in (α, β_2). Then as above, we have the inequality (1.84) in the interval (β_1, α) and the inequality

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\alpha,\beta_2)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\alpha,\beta_2)}(Q_1),$$

which follows from Lemma 7 and Remark 1.8. Together with (1.84) and the fact that $Z_{\{\alpha\}}(Q) \neq 0$, this inequality gives (1.81).

II.2. The function Q_1 has an even number of zeros in the interval (β_1, α) and Q_1 has an odd number of zeros in (α, β_2). Then the number $Z_{(\beta_1,\alpha)}(Q_1)$ can also be zero and we have the following inequality

$$0 = Z_{(\beta_1,\alpha)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\beta_1,\alpha)}(Q_1). \tag{1.85}$$

By Lemma 7 and Remark 1.8, we obtain the inequality (1.83). But since $Q_1(\alpha) = 0$ by assumption and $Q(\alpha) \neq 0$ by (1.4), we have the inequality

$$0 = Z_{\{\alpha\}}(Q) \leqslant -1 + Z_{\{\alpha\}}(Q_1),$$

which, together with the inequality (1.83), implies

$$0 \leqslant Z_{[\alpha,\beta_2)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{[\alpha,\beta_2)}(Q_1).$$

From this inequality and the inequality (1.85) we again obtain (1.81).

If $Q(z) \neq 0$ in the interval (α, β_2), then the inequality (1.81) can be proved analogously. □

Remark 1.10. Corollary 8 remains valid if one of β_1 and β_2 is infinite rather than a zero of φ', that is, if $(\beta_1, \beta_2) = (\beta_1, +\infty)$ or $(\beta_1, \beta_2) = (-\infty, \beta_2)$.

Remark 1.11. If α is a multiple zero of $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ and β_1 and β_2, $\beta_1 < \beta_2$, are zeros of φ' such that $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ and $\varphi'(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in (\beta_1, \alpha) \cup (\alpha, \beta_2)$, then the inequalities (1.81) hold, since we have Case I of Lemma 7 in both intervals (β_1, α) and (α, β_2) in this case.

We now examine the case when φ has a unique real zero α and possesses *property A* at α.

Corollary 9. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ have a unique real zero α such that $\varphi'(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{\alpha\}$. If φ possesses property A at α, then the inequalities* (1.29) *hold.*

Proof. Since φ possesses *property A*, Q associated with φ has no zeros in at least one of the intervals $(-\infty, \alpha)$ and $(\alpha, +\infty)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $Q(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (-\infty, \alpha)$. Then we have

$$0 = Z_{(-\infty,\alpha]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(-\infty,\alpha]}(Q_1), \tag{1.86}$$

since $Q(\alpha) \neq 0$. From Lemma 7 and Remark 1.8 it follows that

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\alpha,+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\alpha,+\infty)}(Q_1). \tag{1.87}$$

The inequalities (1.86)–(1.87) imply (1.30), which is equivalent to (1.29), since $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q)$ and $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_1)$ are even by Corollary 2 and Remark 1.4. □

Our next lemma is devoted to the case when φ does not have a zero between two (not necessary consecutive) zeros of φ'.

Lemma 8. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ and let $\beta^{(1)}$ and $\beta^{(2)}$, $\beta^{(1)} \leqslant \beta^{(2)}$, be zeros of φ' and let $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in [\beta^{(1)}, \beta^{(2)}]$. If φ' has exactly $q \geqslant 2$ real zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval $[\beta^{(1)}, \beta^{(2)}]$, then*

$$q - 1 \leqslant Z_{[\beta^{(1)},\beta^{(2)}]}(Q) \leqslant q - 1 + Z_{[\beta^{(1)},\beta^{(2)}]}(Q_1). \tag{1.88}$$

Proof. In fact, if some real number β is a zero of φ' of multiplicity M, then β is a zero of Q of multiplicity $M - 1$ according to (1.4). Therefore, the following inequalities hold:

$$M - 1 \leqslant Z_{\{\beta\}}(Q) \leqslant M - 1 + Z_{\{\beta\}}(Q_1), \tag{1.89}$$

since $Z_{\{\beta\}}(Q_1) = 0$ by (1.6). Thus, if φ' has exactly l, $1 \leqslant l \leqslant q$, *distinct* real zeros, say $\beta^{(1)} = \beta_1 < \beta_2 < \ldots < \beta_l = \beta^{(2)}$, in the interval $[\beta^{(1)}, \beta^{(2)}]$, then Q has exactly $q - l$ real zeros at the points β_i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, l$, so from (1.89) it follows

$$q - l \leqslant Z_{X_2}(Q) \leqslant q - l + Z_{X_2}(Q_1), \tag{1.90}$$

where $X_2 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} \{\beta_i\}$ and $Z_{X_2}(Q_1) = 0$ by (1.6).

If $l = 1$, then $\beta^{(1)} = \beta^{(2)}$ is a zero of φ' of multiplicity q. By (1.90), we have the following inequalities

$$q - 1 \leqslant Z_{\{\beta^{(1)}\}}(Q) \leqslant q - 1 + Z_{\{\beta^{(1)}\}}(Q_1), \tag{1.91}$$

which are equivalent to (1.88), since $Z_{\{\beta^{(1)}\}}(Q) = Z_{[\beta^{(1)},\beta^{(2)}]}(Q)$ and $Z_{\{\beta^{(1)}\}}(Q_1) = Z_{[\beta^{(1)},\beta^{(2)}]}(Q_1)$ in this case.

Now let $l > 1$. Then the points β_i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, l$, divide the interval $(\beta_1, \beta_l) = (\beta^{(1)}, \beta^{(2)})$ into $l - 1$ subintervals (β_i, β_{i+1}), $i = 1, 2, \ldots, l - 1$. Applying Corollary 6 to each of these subintervals, we get

$$l - 1 \leqslant Z_{X_1}(Q) \leqslant l - 1 + Z_{X_1}(Q_1), \tag{1.92}$$

where $X_1 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l-1} (\beta_i, \beta_{i+1})$.

Since $X_1 \cup X_2 = [\beta^{(1)}, \beta^{(2)}]$, we obtain (1.88) by summing the inequalities (1.90) and (1.92) or, if $\beta^{(1)} = \beta^{(2)}$, directly from (1.91). □

The next corollary concerns half-infinite intervals adjacent to the largest zero of φ.

Corollary 10. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ and let α_L be the largest zero of φ. If φ' has exactly $r \geqslant 1$ zeros in the interval $(\alpha_L, +\infty)$, counting multiplicities, and β_S is the minimal one, then*

$$2\left[\frac{r}{2}\right] \leqslant Z_{[\beta_S,+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant 2\left[\frac{r}{2}\right] + Z_{[\beta_S,+\infty)}(Q_1), \tag{1.93}$$

where $\left[\dfrac{r}{2}\right]$ is the largest integer not exceeding $\dfrac{r}{2}$.

Proof. Let $\beta_S = \beta_1 \leqslant \beta_2 \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \beta_r$ be the zeros of φ' in the interval $(\alpha_L, +\infty)$. Lemma 8 gives

$$r - 1 \leqslant Z_{[\beta_1,\beta_r]}(Q) \leqslant r - 1 + Z_{[\beta_1,\beta_r]}(Q_1). \tag{1.94}$$

We consider the following two cases.

Case I. The number r is odd. There can be only the following two situations:

I.1. The function φ'' has an odd number of zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval $(\beta_r, +\infty)$, say $\gamma_1 \leqslant \gamma_1 \leqslant \gamma_2 \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \gamma_{2M+1}$, $M \geqslant 0$.

From the analyticity of φ and φ' it follows that

$$\varphi(\alpha_L + \varepsilon)\varphi'(\alpha_L + \varepsilon) > 0 \tag{1.95}$$

for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, and

$$\varphi'(\beta_r + \delta)\varphi''(\beta_r + \delta) > 0 \tag{1.96}$$

for all sufficiently small $\delta > 0$. Since r is an odd number, φ' has different signs in the intervals (α_L, β_1) and $(\beta_r, +\infty)$. Therefore, from (1.95) we obtain

$$\varphi(\beta_r + \delta)\varphi'(\beta_r + \delta) < 0 \tag{1.97}$$

for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, since $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (\alpha_L, +\infty)$. Hence, from (1.96) and (1.97) it follows that

$$\varphi(\beta_r + \varepsilon)\varphi''(\beta_r + \varepsilon) < 0 \tag{1.98}$$

for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. This means that $Q(z) < 0$ for $z \in (\beta_r, \gamma_1)$ by (1.4), so

$$0 = Z_{(\beta_1,\gamma_1)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\beta_1,\gamma_1)}(Q_1). \tag{1.99}$$

Here the upper bound cannot be improved, since Q_1 has an even number of zeros in the interval (β_1, γ_1) according to Lemma 1 applied to Q_1. By Case I of Lemma 6, we have

$$0 \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_{2M+1}]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_{2M+1}]}(Q_1). \tag{1.100}$$

But φ'' has different signs in the intervals (β_1, γ_1) and $(\gamma_{2M+1}, +\infty)$, therefore, by (1.98),

$$\varphi(\gamma_{2M+1} + \delta)\varphi''(\gamma_{2M+1} + \delta) > 0$$

for sufficient small $\delta > 0$, so the number $Z_{(\gamma_{2M+1},+\infty)}(Q)$ can be positive according to (1.4). Now we note that Q has an even number of zeros in $(\beta_r, +\infty)$ and in $[\gamma_1, \gamma_{2M+1}]$ by Corollary 1 and Lemma 6. Since Q has no zeros in (β_r, γ_1), it has an even number of zeros in the interval $(\gamma_{2M+1}, +\infty)$. Lemma 5 and Remark 1.7 imply the validity of the inequality (1.20) for $(\gamma_{2M+1}, +\infty)$:

$$Z_{(\gamma_{2M+1},+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\gamma_{2M+1},+\infty)}(Q_1). \tag{1.101}$$

Applying Corollary 1 to Q_1 on the interval $(\gamma_{2M+1}, +\infty)$, we obtain that Q_1 has an even number of zeros in $(\gamma_{2M+1}, +\infty)$ too. Consequently, the inequality (1.101) can be improved to the following one

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\gamma_{2M+1},+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\gamma_{2M+1},+\infty)}(Q_1). \tag{1.102}$$

Here the lower bound follows from the fact, proved above, that Q has an even number of zeros in $(\gamma_{2M+1}, +\infty)$. Now the inequalities (1.94), (1.99), (1.100) and (1.102) imply

$$r - 1 \leqslant Z_{[\beta_s,+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant r - 1 + Z_{[\beta_s,+\infty)}(Q_1), \tag{1.103}$$

which is equivalent to (1.93), since r is odd, so $2\left[\frac{r}{2}\right] = r - 1$.

I.2. The function φ'' has an even number of zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval $(\beta_r, +\infty)$, say $\gamma_1 \leqslant \gamma_1 \leqslant \gamma_2 \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \gamma_{2M}$, $M \geqslant 0$.

Let $M = 0$, that is, $\varphi''(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (\beta_r, +\infty)$. Since r is an odd number, the inequality (1.98) holds as we proved above. Therefore,

$$0 = Z_{(\beta_r,+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\beta_r,+\infty)}(Q_1).$$

Combined with (1.94), this inequality implies (1.103), which is equivalent to (1.93) as we explained above.

Let $M > 0$, then (1.98) and Case III of Lemma 6 imply

$$0 \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_{2M}]}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_{2M}]}(Q_1). \tag{1.104}$$

As above, the inequality (1.98) implies (1.99). Moreover, from the fact that φ'' has an even number of zeros in $(\beta_r, +\infty)$ it follows that φ'' has equal signs in the intervals (β_r, γ_1) and $(\gamma_{2M}, +\infty)$. Then by (1.98), we have the following inequality

$$\varphi(\gamma_{2M} + \varepsilon)\varphi''(\gamma_{2M} + \varepsilon) < 0 \tag{1.105}$$

for sufficiently small ε, so $Z_{(\gamma_{2M},+\infty)}(Q) = 0$ by (1.4). Applying Corollary 1 to Q_1, we obtain that Q_1 has an odd number of zeros in $(\gamma_{2M+1}, +\infty)$ (at least one). Therefore, we have

$$0 = Z_{(\gamma_{2M},+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant -1 + Z_{(\gamma_{2M},+\infty)}(Q_1). \tag{1.106}$$

Now from (1.94), (1.99), (1.104) and (1.106) we again obtain the inequalities (1.103), which are equivalent to (1.93) as above.

Case II. The number $r > 0$ is even. There also can be only two situations:

II.1. The function φ'' has an even number of zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval $(\beta_r, +\infty)$, say $\gamma_1 \leqslant \gamma_1 \leqslant \gamma_2 \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \gamma_{2M}$, $M \geqslant 0$.

Let $M > 0$. According to Corollary 1, Q has an odd number of zeros in $(\beta_r, +\infty)$. But $Q(z)$ is negative for sufficiently large real z as was shown in the proof of Theorem 1, therefore,

$$Q(\beta_r + \varepsilon) > 0 \tag{1.107}$$

for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. From (1.36) it follows that $Q(\gamma_1) < 0$, consequently, Q has an odd number of zeros (at least one) in the interval (β_r, γ_1). This fact and Lemma 5 imply the following inequalities

$$1 \leqslant Z_{(\beta_r,\gamma_1)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\beta_r,\gamma_1)}(Q_1). \tag{1.108}$$

By Lemma 1 applied to Q_1, the latter has an even number of zeros in the interval (β_r, γ_1). Hence, the inequalities (1.108) cannot be improved.

Since φ'' has an even number of zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval $(\beta_r, +\infty)$, φ'' has equal signs in the intervals (β_r, γ_1) and $(\gamma_{2M}, +\infty)$. But Q has at least one zero in (β_r, γ_1) (see (1.108)), therefore from (1.4) it follows that $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z)$ is positive in (β_r, γ_1). Consequently, $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z)$ is also positive in $(\gamma_{2M}, +\infty)$. Thus, by (1.4), the number $Z_{(\gamma_{2M},+\infty)}(Q)$

can be positive. Moreover, since $Q(z)$ is negative for z sufficiently close to γ_{2M} (see (1.36)) and for sufficiently large real z (see the proof of Theorem 1), Q has an even number of zeros in $(\gamma_{2M}, +\infty)$. Lemma 5 and Remark 1.7 imply

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\gamma_{2M},+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\gamma_{2M},+\infty)}(Q_1). \tag{1.109}$$

Here the upper bound cannot be improved, since Q_1 has an odd number of zeros in the interval $(\gamma_{2M}, +\infty)$ by Corollary 1 applied to Q_1.

Since $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) > 0$ in (β_1, γ_1) (see (1.108) and (1.4)), by Case II of Lemma 6, we have

$$0 \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_{2M}]}(Q) \leqslant -1 + Z_{[\gamma_1,\gamma_{2M}]}(Q_1). \tag{1.110}$$

Now from (1.94) and (1.108)–(1.110) we obtain the following inequalities

$$r \leqslant Z_{(\beta_s,+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant r + Z_{(\beta_s,+\infty)}(Q_1), \tag{1.111}$$

which are equivalent to (1.93), since r is even, so $2\left[\frac{r}{2}\right] = r$.

If $M = 0$, that is, $\varphi''(z) \neq 0$ in the interval $(\beta_r, +\infty)$, then we have the inequalities

$$1 \leqslant Z_{(\beta_r,+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\beta_r,+\infty)}(Q_1), \tag{1.112}$$

where the upper bound follows from Lemma 5 and Remark 1.7, and the lower bound follows from (1.107) and from the fact that $Q(z) < 0$ for sufficiently large real z.

By (1.94) and (1.112), we again obtain (1.111), which is equivalent to (1.93) as we showed above.

II.2. The function φ'' has an odd number of zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval $(\beta_r, +\infty)$, say $\gamma_1 \leqslant \gamma_1 \leqslant \gamma_2 \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \gamma_{2M+1}$, $M \geqslant 0$.

As in Case II.1, Corollary 1 implies the inequality (1.107), from which the inequalities (1.108) follow by Lemma 5 and Remark 1.7. Furthermore, from Case III of Lemma 6 we obtain the inequalities (1.100). Since Q has at least one zero in the interval (β_r, γ_1) (see (1.108)), $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) > 0$ in (β_r, γ_1) by (1.4). But φ'' has an odd number of zeros in $(\beta_r, +\infty)$ by assumption, and $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ in this interval, therefore, $\varphi(z)\varphi''(z) < 0$ in $(\gamma_{2M+1}, +\infty)$ and Q has no zeros in the interval $(\gamma_{2M+1}, +\infty)$. This fact implies the following inequality

$$0 = Z_{(\gamma_{2M+1},+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\gamma_{2M+1},+\infty)}(Q_1),$$

which, together with (1.100), and (1.108) implies (1.112). Now by (1.94) and (1.112), we obtain (1.111), which is equivalent to (1.93) as we showed in Case II.1.

□

Remark 1.12. Corollary 10 remains valid with respective modification in the case when φ has the smallest zero a_S.

Remark 1.13. The number r in Corollary 10 is the number of extra zeros of φ' in $(\alpha_L, +\infty)$.

Now we establish bounds on the number of real zeros of Q associated with functions in $\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ with finitely many real zeros. Next theorem concerns real polynomials multiplied by exponential.

Theorem 3. *Let p be a real polynomial and let φ be the function*

$$\varphi(z) = e^{bz}p(z), \tag{1.113}$$

where $b \neq 0$ is a real number. If φ possesses property A, then

$$2\left[\frac{E(\varphi')}{2}\right] \leqslant Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) \leqslant 2\left[\frac{E(\varphi')}{2}\right] + Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_1). \tag{1.114}$$

Here $E(\varphi')$ is the number of extra zeros of φ'.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that $b > 0$ and the leading coefficient of p is also positive. Then $\varphi(z) \to +\infty$ whenever $z \to +\infty$ and $\varphi(z) \to 0$ whenever $z \to -\infty$.

We consider the following two cases: I. p has no real zeros, and II. p has at least one real zero.

Case I. Let $p(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\deg p$ is even and $\varphi'(z) = e^{bz}[p'(z) + bp(z)]$. Thus, φ' has no real zeros or it has an even number of real zeros, all of which are extra zeros of φ'.

If $\varphi'(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$, then $E(\varphi') = 0$, and, by Corollary 7, we obtain the validity of (1.29), which is equivalent to (1.114) in this case.

Let φ' have an even number of real zeros, say $\beta_1 \leqslant \beta_2 \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \beta_{2r}$, where $r > 0$, then $E(\varphi') = 2r$. Since $b > 0$ and $\varphi(z) > 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$ by assumption, $\varphi'(z) \to +\infty$ whenever $z \to +\infty$ and $\varphi'(z) \to +0$ whenever $z \to -\infty$. In particular, we have

$$\varphi'(z) > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad z \in (-\infty, \beta_1) \cup (\beta_{2r}, +\infty). \tag{1.115}$$

Also $\varphi''(z) \to +\infty$ whenever $z \to +\infty$ and $\varphi''(z) \to +0$ whenever $z \to -\infty$. By the analyticity of φ', the following inequalities hold

$$\varphi'(\beta_1 - \varepsilon)\varphi''(\beta_1 - \varepsilon) < 0, \tag{1.116}$$

$$\varphi'(\beta_{2r} + \delta)\varphi''(\beta_{2r} + \delta) > 0 \tag{1.117}$$

for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ (see (1.96)). These inequalities with (1.115) imply $\varphi''(\beta_1 - \varepsilon) < 0$ and $\varphi''(\beta_{2r} + \delta) > 0$ for all sufficiently small positive ε and δ. Therefore, φ'' has an odd number of zeros in the interval $(-\infty, \beta_1)$ and an even number of zeros (or no zeros) in the interval $(\beta_{2r}, +\infty)$. Moreover, $Q(\beta_1 - \varepsilon) < 0$ and $Q(\beta_{2r} + \delta) > 0$ for all sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, since the sign of Q in a small vicinity of a real zero of φ' equals the sign of $\varphi\varphi''$ in that vicinity (see (1.4)) and since $\varphi(z) > 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$ by assumption. As was mentioned in Theorem 1, $Q(z)$ is negative for sufficiently large real z, consequently, Q has an even number of zeros (possibly no zeros) in the interval $(-\infty, \beta_1)$ and an odd number of zeros in $(\beta_{2r}, +\infty)$. Thus,

$$Z_{(\beta_{2r}, +\infty)}(Q) \geqslant 1. \tag{1.118}$$

From Lemma 8 it follows that

$$2r - 1 \leqslant Z_{[\beta_1, \beta_{2r}]}(Q) \leqslant 2r - 1 + Z_{[\beta_1, \beta_{2r}]}(Q_1). \tag{1.119}$$

If φ'' has zeros in $(\beta_{2r}, +\infty)$, say $\gamma_1^{(+)} \leqslant \gamma_2^{(+)} \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \gamma_{2M}^{(+)}$, $M > 0$, then, by (1.117) and by Case II of Lemma 6, we have

$$0 \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1^{(+)}, \gamma_{2M}^{(+)}]}(Q) \leqslant -1 + Z_{[\gamma_1^{(+)}, \gamma_{2M}^{(+)}]}(Q_1). \tag{1.120}$$

Lemma 5 and Remark 1.7 yield

$$Z_{(\gamma_{2M}^{(+)},+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\gamma_{2M}^{(+)},+\infty)}(Q_1), \tag{1.121}$$

$$Z_{(\beta_{2r},\gamma_1^{(+)})}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\beta_{2r},\gamma_1^{(+)})}(Q_1). \tag{1.122}$$

Then from (1.118) and (1.120)–(1.122) it follows that

$$1 \leqslant Z_{(\beta_{2r},+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\beta_{2r},+\infty)}(Q_1). \tag{1.123}$$

These inequalities cannot be improved, since $Z_{(\beta_{2r},+\infty)}(Q_1)$ is even by Lemma 2 applied to Q_1.

If $\varphi''(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (\beta_{2r}, +\infty)$, then, by Lemma 5 with Remark 1.7 and by (1.118), we obtain the inequalities (1.123) again.

Since φ'' has an odd number of zeros in $(-\infty, \beta_1)$, say $\gamma_1^{(-)} \leqslant \gamma_2^{(-)} \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \gamma_{2N+1}^{(-)}$, $N \geqslant 0$, and $\varphi''(z) < 0$ in $(\gamma_{2N+1}^{(-)}, \beta_1)$ as we showed above, $\varphi''(z) > 0$ in $(-\infty, \gamma_1^{(-)})$. Then we have

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(-\infty,\gamma_1^{(-)})}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(-\infty,\gamma_1^{(-)})}(Q_1), \tag{1.124}$$

$$0 \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1^{(-)},\gamma_{2N+1}^{(-)}]}(Q) \leqslant Z_{[\gamma_1^{(-)},\gamma_{2N+1}^{(-)}]}(Q_1), \tag{1.125}$$

$$0 = Z_{(\gamma_{2N+1}^{(-)},\beta_1)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\gamma_{2N+1}^{(-)},\beta_1)}(Q_1). \tag{1.126}$$

Indeed, the inequalities (1.124) follow from Lemma 5 with Remark 1.7 and the fact that Q_1 has an even number of zeros in $(-\infty, \gamma_1^{(-)})$ by Corollary 1 applied to Q_1. At the same time, the lower bound of the inequalities (1.124) cannot be improved, since Q has an even number of zeros in the interval $(-\infty, \gamma_1^{(-)})$ by (1.36) and by the fact that $Q(z) < 0$ for sufficiently large real z. Further, the inequalities (1.125) are exactly (1.33). At last, since $\varphi''(z) < 0$ in $(\gamma_{2N+1}^{(-)}, \beta_1)$ and $\varphi(z) > 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$, $Q(z)$ has no zeros in $(\gamma_{2N+1}^{(-)}, \beta_1)$ by (1.4). This fact we use in (1.126).

Now (1.119), (1.123) and (1.124)–(1.126) imply

$$2r \leqslant Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) \leqslant 2r + Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_1).$$

These inequalities are equivalent to (1.114), since $E(\varphi') = 2r$.

Case II. Let φ have at least one real zero.

Let α_S and α_L be the smallest and the largest zeros of φ. It is easy to see that, for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\varphi(\alpha_S - \varepsilon)\varphi'(\alpha_S - \varepsilon) < 0. \tag{1.127}$$

Also since $\varphi(z) \to 0$ whenever $z \to -\infty$, we have, for sufficiently large negative C,

$$\varphi(C)\varphi'(C) > 0. \tag{1.128}$$

From (1.127)–(1.128) it follows that φ' has an odd number of zeros, counting multiplicities, say $2r_- + 1, r_- \geqslant 0$, in $(-\infty, \alpha_S)$, since $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ in $(-\infty, \alpha_S)$. Let β_L^- be the largest zero of φ' in the interval $(-\infty, \alpha_S)$. Then by Corollary 10 and by Remark 1.12, we have

$$2r_- \leqslant Z_{(-\infty,\beta_L^-]}(Q) \leqslant 2r_- + Z_{(-\infty,\beta_L^-]}(Q_1), \tag{1.129}$$

since $2r_- = 2\left[\dfrac{2r_- + 1}{2}\right]$.

Further, by assumption, $\varphi(z)$ is positive for $z \in (\alpha_L, +\infty)$ and tends to $+\infty$ whenever z tends to $+\infty$. Therefore, $\varphi'(z) \to +\infty$ as $z \to +\infty$ and, by (1.95), we have $\varphi'(z) > 0$ in a small right-sided neighborhood of the point α_L. Consequently, φ' has an even number of zeros, counting multiplicities, say $2r_+ \geqslant 0$, in the interval $(\alpha_L, +\infty)$. If φ' has at least one zero in $(\alpha_L, +\infty)$ and β_S^+ is the smallest one, then, by Corollary 10, we have

$$2r_+ \leqslant Z_{[\beta_S^+, +\infty)}(Q) \leqslant 2r_+ + Z_{[\beta_S^+, +\infty)}(Q_1) \tag{1.130}$$

since $2r_+ = 2\left[\dfrac{2r_+}{2}\right]$.

II.1 Let φ have a unique real zero α. Then $\alpha = \alpha_S = \alpha_L$.

If φ' has no zeros in the interval $(\alpha, +\infty)$ and has exactly $2r_- + 1$ zeros, counting multiplicities, in $(-\infty, \alpha)$, then from Corollary 8 and Remark 1.10 it follows that

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\beta_L^-, +\infty)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\beta_L^-, +\infty)}(Q_1), \tag{1.131}$$

where β_L^- is the largest zero of φ' in the interval $(-\infty, \alpha)$. Now the inequalities (1.129) and (1.131) imply (1.114), since $E(\varphi') = 2r_- + 1$ in this case.

Let φ' have exactly $2r_+ > 0$ zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval $(\alpha, +\infty)$ and let β_S^+ be the smallest one. By Corollary 8, we have

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\beta_L^-, \beta_S^+)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\beta_L^-, \beta_S^+)}(Q_1). \tag{1.132}$$

This inequality, together with (1.129) and (1.130), gives (1.114), since $E(\varphi') = 2r_+ + 2r_- + 1$ in this case.

II.2 Let φ have exactly $l \geqslant 2$ *distinct* real zeros, say $\alpha_S = \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \ldots < \alpha_l = \alpha_L$. By Rolle's theorem, φ' has an odd number of zeros, say $2M_i + 1$, $M_i \geqslant 0$, counting multiplicities, in each of the intervals (α_i, α_{i+1}), $i = 1, 2, \ldots, l-1$. If we denote by $\beta_S^{(1)}$ and $\beta_L^{(l-1)}$ the smallest zero of φ' in the interval (α_1, α_2) and the largest zero of φ' in the interval (α_{l-1}, α_l), then, by Lemma 8 and Corollary 8, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l-1} 2M_i \leqslant Z_{[\beta_S^{(1)}, \beta_L^{(l-1)}]}(Q) \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} 2M_i + Z_{[\beta_S^{(1)}, \beta_L^{(l-1)}]}(Q_1). \tag{1.133}$$

In the interval $(\beta_L^-, \beta_S^{(1)})$, we use Corollary 8 to yield

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\beta_L^-, \beta_S^{(1)})}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\beta_L^-, \beta_S^{(1)})}(Q_1), \tag{1.134}$$

where β_L^- is the largest zero of φ' in the interval $(-\infty, \alpha_1)$. The existence of this zero was proved above.

If φ' has no zeros in the interval $(\alpha_l, +\infty)$, then, by Corollary 8 and by Remark 1.10, we have

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\beta_L^{(l-1)}, +\infty)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\beta_L^{(l-1)}, +\infty)}(Q_1). \tag{1.135}$$

Thus, if we suppose that φ' has $2r_- + 1$ zeros, counting multiplicities, in $(-\infty, \alpha_1)$, then $E(\varphi') = 2r_- + 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} 2M_i$, so the inequalities (1.129), (1.134), (1.133) and (1.135) imply (1.114).

If φ' has at least one zero in the interval $(\alpha_l, +\infty)$ and β_S^+ is the smallest one, then, by Corollary 8, we have

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\beta_L^{(l-1)}, \beta_S^+)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\beta_L^{(l-1)}, \beta_S^+)}(Q_1). \tag{1.136}$$

If we suppose that φ' has $2r_+ > 0$ zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval $(\alpha_l, +\infty)$ and it has $2r_-+1$ zeros, counting multiplicities, in $(-\infty, \alpha_1)$, then $E(\varphi') = 2r_-+2r_++1+\sum_{i=1}^{l-1} 2M_i$, so (1.114) follows from (1.129), (1.134), (1.133), (1.136) and (1.130).

□

Now we derive a bound on the number of real zeros of Q associated with a real polynomial.

Theorem 4. *Let φ be a real polynomial possessing property A.*

I. *If $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$, then*

$$2\left[\frac{E(\varphi')}{2}\right] + 2 \leqslant Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) \leqslant 2\left[\frac{E(\varphi')}{2}\right] + 2 + Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_1), \tag{1.137}$$

where $E(\varphi')$ is the number of extra zeros of φ'.

II. *If φ has at least one real zero, then the inequalities* (1.114) *hold.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the leading coefficient of φ is positive. Then $\varphi(z) \to +\infty$ whenever $z \to +\infty$ and $\varphi(z) \to \infty$ whenever $z \to -\infty$.

I. Let $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\deg \varphi$ is even and $\deg \varphi' = \deg \varphi - 1$. Consequently, φ' has an odd number of zeros, all of which are extra zeros of φ' (see (1.1)).

We denote the real zeros of φ' by $\beta_1 \leqslant \beta_2 \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \beta_{2r+1}$, so $E(\varphi') = 2r + 1$. By assumption, $\varphi(z) > 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$, therefore, $\varphi'(z) \to +\infty$ whenever $z \to +\infty$ and $\varphi'(z) \to -\infty$ whenever $z \to -\infty$. Consequently, $\varphi'(z) < 0$ for $z \in (-\infty, \beta_1)$ and $\varphi'(z) > 0$ for $z \in (\beta_{2r+1}, +\infty)$. Also $\varphi''(z) \to +\infty$ whenever $z \to \pm\infty$. As in the proof of Theorem 3, one can show that the inequality (1.116) holds and implies $\varphi''(\beta_1 - \varepsilon) > 0$ for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. Analogously to (1.117), we have

$$\varphi'(\beta_{2r+1} + \delta)\varphi''(\beta_{2r+1} + \delta) > 0 \tag{1.138}$$

for all sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, that is, $\varphi''(\beta_{2r+1} + \delta) > 0$. Therefore, φ'' has an even number of zeros in each of the intervals $(-\infty, \beta_1)$ and $(\beta_{2r+1}, +\infty)$. Moreover, since $\varphi(z) > 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$ by assumption, $Q(\beta_1 - \varepsilon) > 0$ and $Q(\beta_{2r+1} + \delta) > 0$ for all sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ according to (1.4). But $Q(z) < 0$ for all sufficiently large real z (see the proof of Theorem 1), consequently, Q has an odd number of zeros in each of the intervals $(-\infty, \beta_1)$ and $(\beta_{2r+1}, +\infty)$. Thus,

$$Z_{(-\infty, \beta_1)}(Q) \geqslant 1, \tag{1.139}$$

$$Z_{(\beta_{2r+1}, +\infty)}(Q) \geqslant 1. \tag{1.140}$$

By Lemma 8, we have

$$2r \leqslant Z_{[\beta_1, \beta_{2r+1}]}(Q) \leqslant 2r + Z_{[\beta_1, \beta_{2r+1}]}(Q_1). \tag{1.141}$$

Since φ'' has an even number of zeros in each of the intervals $(-\infty, \beta_1)$ and $(\beta_{2r+1}, +\infty)$, in the same way as in Case I of Theorem 3 (see (1.123)), one can show that

$$1 \leqslant Z_{(-\infty,\beta_1)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(-\infty,\beta_1)}(Q_1), \tag{1.142}$$

$$1 \leqslant Z_{(\beta_{2r+1},+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant 1 + Z_{(\beta_{2r+1},+\infty)}(Q_1). \tag{1.143}$$

Now (1.141)–(1.143) imply

$$2r + 2 \leqslant Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) \leqslant 2r + 2 + Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_1),$$

which is equivalent to (1.137), since $E(\varphi') = 2r + 1$ and, therefore, $2\left[\dfrac{E(\varphi')}{2}\right] = 2r$.

II. Let φ have at least one real zero and let α_S and α_L be the smallest and the largest zeros of φ. It is easy to see that the inequality (1.127) holds in this case. Moreover, since $\varphi(z) \to \infty$ whenever $z \to -\infty$, we have, for sufficiently large negative C, $\varphi(C)\varphi'(C) < 0$. Consequently, φ' has an even number of zeros (or has no zeros) in $(-\infty, \alpha_S)$, since $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Analogously, φ' has an even number of zeros (or has no zeros) in $(\alpha_L, +\infty)$. Further, we consider the following two cases.

II.1 Let φ has a unique real zero $\alpha = \alpha_S = \alpha_L$. If $\varphi'(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{\alpha\}$, then by Corollary 9, the inequality (1.29) holds. The latter is equivalent to (1.114), since $E(\varphi') = 0$ in this case.

Now suppose that φ' has at least one zero in one of the intervals $(-\infty, \alpha)$ and $(\alpha, +\infty)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\varphi'(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in (-\infty, \alpha)$ and φ' has an even number of zeros, counting multiplicities, say $2r_+ > 0$, in $(\alpha, +\infty)$. Let β_S^+ be the smallest zero of φ' in this interval. Then by the same argument as in Case II of Theorem 3, one can prove that the inequalities (1.130) hold. Moreover, by Corollary 8 and Remark 1.10, we have

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(-\infty,\beta_S^+)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(-\infty,\beta_S^+)}(Q_1).$$

Combined with (1.130), these inequalities give (1.114), since $E(\varphi') = 2r_+$ in this case.

At last, let φ have a unique real zero α and let φ' has at least one zero in each of the intervals $(-\infty, \alpha)$ and $(\alpha, +\infty)$. Let φ' have exactly $2r_- > 0$ zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval $(-\infty, \alpha)$ and exactly $2r_+ > 0$ zeros, counting multiplicities, in $(\alpha, +\infty)$. Let β_L^- be the largest zero of φ' in $(-\infty, \alpha)$ and let β_S^+ be the smallest zero of φ' in $(\alpha, +\infty)$. From Corollaries 10 and 8 it follows that the inequalities (1.129), (1.130) and (1.132) hold. These inequalities imply (1.114), since $E(\varphi') = 2r_- + 2r_+$ in this case.

II.2 Let now φ' have $l \geqslant 2$ *distinct* real zeros, counting multiplicities, say $\alpha_1 < \ldots < \alpha_l$. Then by Rolle's theorem, φ' has an odd number of zeros, say $2M_i + 1$, $M_i \geqslant 0$, counting multiplicities, in each of the intervals (α_i, α_{i+1}), $i = 1, 2, \ldots, l-1$. If $\beta_S^{(1)}$ is the smallest zero of φ' in the interval (α_1, α_2) and $\beta_L^{(l-1)}$ is the largest zero of φ' in the interval (α_{l-1}, α_l), then, as in the proof of Case II of Theorem 3, the inequalities (1.133) hold by Lemma 8 and Corollary 8. Moreover, if φ' has $2r_- \geqslant 0$ zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval $(-\infty, \alpha_1)$ and $2r_+ \geqslant 0$ zeros, counting multiplicities, in the interval $(\alpha_l, +\infty)$, then Corollaries 10 and 8 with Remark 1.10 imply

$$2r_- \leqslant Z_{(-\infty,\beta_S^{(1)})}(Q) \leqslant 2r_- + Z_{(-\infty,\beta_S^{(1)})}(Q_1) \tag{1.144}$$

and

$$2r_+ \leqslant Z_{(\beta_L^{(l-1)},+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant 2r_+ + Z_{(\beta_L^{(l-1)},+\infty)}(Q_1), \tag{1.145}$$

since $2r_- = 2\left[\frac{2r_-}{2}\right]$ and $2r_+ = 2\left[\frac{2r_+}{2}\right]$. Obviously, we have $E(\varphi') = 2r_+ + 2r_- + \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} 2M_i$ in this case. Therefore, the inequalities (1.114) follow from (1.133), (1.144) and (1.145).

□

Our next theorem concerns the last subclass of entire functions in $\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ with finitely many zeros, namely, polynomials multiplied by exponentials of the form e^{-az^2+bz}.

Theorem 5. *Let p be a real polynomial and let φ be the function*

$$\varphi(z) = e^{-az^2+bz}p(z), \tag{1.146}$$

where $a > 0$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$. Let φ possess property A.

I. *If p has no real zeros, then the inequalities* (1.114) *hold.*

II. *If p has at least one real zero, then*

$$2\left[\frac{E(\varphi')}{2}\right] - 2 \leqslant Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) \leqslant 2\left[\frac{E(\varphi')}{2}\right] - 2 + Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_1), \tag{1.147}$$

where $E(\varphi')$ is the number of extra zeros of φ'.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the leading coefficient of p is positive. Then $\varphi(z) \to +0$ whenever $z \to +\infty$ and $\varphi(z) \to 0$ whenever $z \to -\infty$.

I. Let $p(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\deg p$ is even and $\varphi'(z) = e^{-az^2+bz}g(z)$, where g is a real polynomial of odd degree, which is equal to $\deg p + 1$. Thus, φ' has an odd number of zeros, counting multiplicities, say $\beta_1 \leqslant \beta_2 \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \beta_{2r+1}$, all of which are extra zeros of φ'. Therefore, the inequalities (1.141) hold in this case.

Since $p(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi(z) > 0$ on the real axis and $\varphi(z) \to +0$ whenever $z \to \pm\infty$ by assumption. Then $\varphi'(z) \to -0$ whenever $z \to +\infty$ and $\varphi'(z) \to +0$ whenever $z \to -\infty$. In particular, $\varphi'(z) > 0$ for $z \in (-\infty, \beta_1)$ and $\varphi'(z) < 0$ for $z \in (\beta_{2r+1}, +\infty)$. Also $\varphi''(z) \to +0$ whenever $z \to \pm\infty$. From the inequality (1.116) it follows that $\varphi''(\beta_1 - \varepsilon) < 0$ for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. By the similar reasoning, one can show that $\varphi''(\beta_{2r+1} + \delta) < 0$ for all sufficiently small $\delta > 0$. Consequently, φ'' has an odd number of zeros in each of the intervals $(-\infty, \beta_1)$ and $(\beta_{2r+1}, +\infty)$. Moreover, since $\varphi(z)$ is positive on the real line by assumption, $Q(\beta_1 - \varepsilon) < 0$ and $Q(\beta_{2r+1} - \delta) < 0$ for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ by (1.4). Consequently, Q has an even number of zeros in each of the intervals $(-\infty, \beta_1)$ and $(\beta_{2r+1}, +\infty)$, because $Q(z) < 0$ for all sufficiently large real z (see the proof of Theorem 1). Thus, in the same way as in the proof of Case I of Theorem 3 (see (1.124)–(1.126)), it is easy to show that

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(-\infty,\beta_1)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(-\infty,\beta_1)}(Q_1). \tag{1.148}$$

And analogously,

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\beta_{2r+1},+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\beta_{2r+1},+\infty)}(Q_1). \tag{1.149}$$

Since $E(\varphi')=2r+1$ in this case, the inequalities (1.141) and (1.148)–(1.149) imply (1.114).

II. Let p have at least one real zero and let α_S and α_L be the smallest and the largest zeros of φ. It is easy to see that the inequalities (1.127) and (1.128) hold in this case. From these inequalities it follows that φ' has an odd number of zeros, counting multiplicities, say $2r_-+1, r_- \geqslant 0$, in $(-\infty,\alpha_S)$, since $\varphi(z)\neq 0$ in this interval. Analogously, one can show that φ' has an odd number of zeros, counting multiplicities, say $2r_++1, r_+\geqslant 0$, in the interval $(\alpha_L,+\infty)$. Let β_L^- be the largest zero of φ' in the interval $(-\infty,\alpha_S)$ and let β_S^+ be the smallest zero of φ' in $(\alpha_L,+\infty)$. Then by Corollary 10, we have

$$2r_- \leqslant Z_{(-\infty,\beta_L^-]}(Q) \leqslant 2r_- + Z_{(-\infty,\beta_L^-]}(Q_1), \tag{1.150}$$

$$2r_+ \leqslant Z_{[\beta_S^+,+\infty)}(Q) \leqslant 2r_+ + Z_{[\beta_S^+,+\infty)}(Q_1), \tag{1.151}$$

since $2r_- = 2\left[\dfrac{2r_-+1}{2}\right]$ and $2r_+ = 2\left[\dfrac{2r_++1}{2}\right]$.

If φ has a unique real zero $\alpha=\alpha_S=\alpha_L$, then by Corollary 8, we have

$$0 \leqslant Z_{(\beta_L^-,\beta_S^+)}(Q) \leqslant Z_{(\beta_L^-,\beta_S^+)}(Q_1). \tag{1.152}$$

Summing the inequalities (1.150)–(1.152), we obtain (1.147), since $E(\varphi')=2r_-+1+2r_++1$ in this case.

If φ has exactly $l\geqslant 2$ *distinct* zeros, say $\alpha_1<\alpha_2<\ldots<\alpha_l$, then by Rolle's theorem, φ' has an odd number of zeros, say $2M_i+1$, $M_i\geqslant 0$, counting multiplicities, in each of the intervals (α_i,α_{i+1}), $i=1,2,\ldots,l-1$. As above, from Lemma 8 and Corollary 8 it follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l-1} 2M_i \leqslant Z_{(\beta_L^-,\beta_S^+)}(Q) \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} 2M_i + Z_{(\beta_L^-,\beta_S^+)}(Q_1). \tag{1.153}$$

Now the inequalities (1.150)–(1.151) and (1.153) imply

$$2r_-+2r_++\sum_{i=1}^{l-1}2M_i \leqslant Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) \leqslant 2r_-+2r_++\sum_{i=1}^{l-1}2M_i + Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_1),$$

which is equivalent to (1.147), since $E(\varphi')=2r_-+1+2r_++1+\sum_{i=1}^{l-1}2M_i$. □

The next theorem provides a bound on the number of real zeros of Q associated with a function in $\mathcal{L}-\mathcal{P}^*$ with infinitely many real zeros.

Theorem 6. *Let $\varphi\in\mathcal{L}-\mathcal{P}^*$ and suppose that φ has infinitely many real zeros. If φ possesses property A, then the inequalities* (1.114) *hold.*

Proof. If φ has infinitely many positive and negative zeros, then φ' can have extra zeros only between two consecutive zeros of φ. Therefore, $E(\varphi')$ is an even number and the inequalities (1.114) follow from Lemma 8 and Corollary 8.

Let φ have infinitely many real zeros but only finitely many positive or negative zeros. Without loss of generality, we may assume that φ has the largest real zero, say α_L. If $\beta<\alpha_L$ is a zero of φ' such that $\varphi(z)\neq 0$ and $\varphi'(z)\neq 0$ for $z\in(\beta,\alpha)$, then applying Lemma 8 and Corollary 8 to the interval $(-\infty,\beta]$ and Corollaries 8 and 10 (see also Remark 1.10) to the interval $(\beta,+\infty)$, we again obtain (1.114). □

Now we are able to prove Theorem 2.

Theorem 2. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ and suppose that φ has exactly $2m$ nonreal zeros. If φ possesses property A, then*

$$2m - 2m_1 \leqslant Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) \leqslant 2m - 2m_1 + Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q_1), \tag{1.154}$$

where $2m_1 = Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\varphi')$.

Proof. We consider the following four cases.

I. Let φ be a real polynomial. Then φ' has exactly $\deg\varphi - 1$ zeros, counting multiplicities.

If $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\deg\varphi = 2m$ and all real zeros of φ' are extra zeros. Therefore, $E(\varphi') = 2m - 2m_1 - 1$ (see (1.3)), so, by Theorem 4, the inequalities (1.137) imply (1.154).

If φ has at least one real zero and $\deg\varphi = 2m+r$, where $r > 0$ is the number of real zeros of φ, counting multiplicities, then φ' has exactly $2m-2m_1+r-1$ real zeros, counting multiplicities, $r-1$ of which are guaranteed by Rolle's theorem. Therefore, we have $E(\varphi') = 2m - 2m_1$, and the inequalities (1.154) follow from (1.114) by Theorem 4.

II. Let φ be a function of the type (1.113). Then φ' has exactly $\deg p$ zeros, counting multiplicities.

If $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\deg p = 2m$ and all real zeros of φ' are extra zeros. Therefore, $E(\varphi') = 2m - 2m_1$, so from (1.114) we obtain (1.154) by Theorem 3.

If φ has at least one real zero and $\deg p = 2m + r$, where $r > 0$ is the number of real zeros of φ, counting multiplicities, then φ' has exactly $2m-2m_1+r$ real zeros, counting multiplicities, $r-1$ of which are guaranteed by Rolle's theorem. Consequently, $E(\varphi') = 2m - 2m_1 + 1$, and the inequalities (1.154) again follow from (1.114) by Theorem 3.

III. If φ is a function of the type (1.146), then φ' has exactly $\deg p+1$ zeros, counting multiplicities.

Let $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\deg p = 2m$ and all real zeros of φ' are extra zeros. Therefore, $E(\varphi') = 2m - 2m_1 + 1$, and from (1.114) it follows that the inequalities (1.154) hold by Theorem 5.

If φ has at least one real zero and $\deg p = 2m+r$, where $r > 0$ is the number of real zeros of φ, counting multiplicities, then φ' has exactly $2m-2m_1+r+1$ real zeros, counting multiplicities, $r-1$ of which are guaranteed by Rolle's theorem. Consequently, $E(\varphi') = 2m-2m_1+2$. Now the inequalities (1.154) follow from (1.147) by Theorem 5.

IV. If φ has infinitely many real zeros, then, by (1.3), we have

$$2m - 2m_1 \leqslant E(\varphi') \leqslant 2m - 2m_1 + 1.$$

From these inequalities and (1.114) we obtain (1.154) by Theorem 6.

□

Remark 1.14. In the proofs of Theorems 3, 4, 5 and 6, we used the fact that φ possesses *property A* only when we applied Corollary 8. Moreover, in the proof of Corollary 8, we used *property A* only for the upper bound but not for the lower one. Therefore, in Theorem 2, the lower bound of the number $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q)$ is universal, that is, it does not depend on *property A* and holds for every

function in the class $\mathcal{L}-\mathcal{P}^*$. Thus, Theorem 2 proves Proposition 1 from Introduction for entire functions in $\mathcal{L}-\mathcal{P}^*$ and, in particular, for real polynomials.

Remark 1.15. If a function $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}-\mathcal{P}^*$ has only multiple real zeros, then, in the proofs of Theorems 3, 4 and 5, we can use Remark 1.11 instead of Corollary 8. Thus, the inequalities (1.154) also hold for functions in $\mathcal{L}-\mathcal{P}^*$ with only multiple real zeros.

In conclusion of this section, we note that, by Theorem 2 and Remark 1.15, we know two subclasses of the class $\mathcal{L}-\mathcal{P}^*$ such that for functions from these subclasses the inequalities (1.154) hold. G. Csordas posed the following problem.

Open problem. *Describe all functions in $\mathcal{L}-\mathcal{P}^*$ satisfying the inequalities* (1.154).

2 Proof of the Hawaii conjecture.

Although Theorem 2 is a very useful tool, it is not valid for every function in $\mathcal{L}-\mathcal{P}^*$. Recently S. Edwards [8] found an example of a polynomial, which does not enjoy *property A* and fails (1.154) (see Remark 1.8). However, for a given function φ in $\mathcal{L}-\mathcal{P}^*$, we can always find another function ψ_* in $\mathcal{L}-\mathcal{P}^*$ with *property A*, which has the same zeros and the same associated function Q. The following theorem establishes the existence of such a function.

Theorem 7. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}-\mathcal{P}^*$. Then there exist a real number σ_* such that $\psi_*(z)=e^{-\sigma_* z}\varphi(z)$ possesses property A. Moreover, if $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q)\neq 0$, then $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*')<Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*)$.*

Proof. At first, we notice that, for any real σ, the function $\psi(z)=e^{-\sigma z}\varphi(z)$ has the same set of zeros as the function $\varphi(z)$. At the same time, we have the following relations:

$$\frac{\psi'(z)}{\psi(z)}=\frac{\varphi'(z)}{\varphi(z)}-\sigma, \qquad Q[\psi]=Q[\varphi]. \tag{2.1}$$

By Theorem 1, the function $Q[\varphi]$ has finitely many real zeros. If $Q[\varphi]$ has no real zeros, then, for any real σ, $\psi(z)=e^{-\sigma z}\varphi(z)$ automatically possesses *property A*.

Let $Q[\varphi]$ have at least one real zero and let $\zeta_1<\zeta_2<\ldots<\zeta_n$, $n\geqslant 1$, be the *distinct* real zeros of $Q[\varphi]$. We set

$$\sigma_*=\max_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n}\left(\frac{\varphi'(\zeta_i)}{\varphi(\zeta_i)}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_*(z)=e^{-\sigma_* z}\varphi(z).$$

Then from (2.1) applied to ψ_* it follows that

$$\frac{\psi_*'(\zeta_i)}{\psi_*(\zeta_i)}\leqslant 0, \quad i=1,\ldots,n. \tag{2.2}$$

In the sequel, we denote by ζ_* any (fixed) zero of $Q[\varphi]$ where the maximum $\sigma_*=\max\limits_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n}(\varphi'(\zeta_i)/\varphi(\zeta_i))$ is attained. Thus, we have

$$\frac{\psi_*'(\zeta_*)}{\psi_*(\zeta_*)}=0. \tag{2.3}$$

We also denote by α_j ($j \in \mathbb{Z}$) the *real* zeros of φ (and of ψ_*) and $I_j = (\alpha_j, \alpha_{j+1})$. If φ has the largest zero α_L and the smallest zero α_S, then we also consider the intervals

$$I_{+\infty} = (\alpha_L, +\infty) \quad \text{and} \quad I_{-\infty} = (-\infty, \alpha_S).$$

We now show that ψ_* possesses *property A*. If φ has no real zeros, then ψ_* also has no real zeros and, therefore, it possesses *property A*.

Suppose that φ has at least one real zero. Consider the interval I_j for a fixed j. Let β be the leftmost zero of ψ_*'/ψ_* in I_j. The existence of this zero is guaranteed by Rolle's theorem. Since $\psi_*'(z)/\psi_*(z) \to +\infty$ whenever $z \searrow \alpha_j$ (see (1.9)), we have $\psi_*'(z)/\psi_*(z) > 0$ for $z \in (\alpha_j, \beta)$. Now from (2.2) it follows that $Q[\psi_*]$ has no zeros in (α_j, β). Consequently, ψ_* possesses *property A* at α_j. In particular, if ψ_* has the smallest zero $\alpha_S = \alpha_1$, then considering the interval I_1, we obtain that ψ_* possesses *property A* at α_S. Let ψ_* have the largest zero α_L. If ψ_*'/ψ_* has no zeros in the interval $I_{+\infty}$, then $\psi_*'(z)/\psi_*(z) > 0$ for $z \in I_{+\infty}$, since $\psi_*'(z)/\psi_*(z) \to +\infty$ whenever $z \searrow \alpha_L$ (see (1.9)). Therefore, by (2.2), we have $Q[\psi_*](z) \neq 0$ in the interval $(\alpha_L, +\infty)$, and ψ_* also possesses *property A* at α_L. If ψ_*'/ψ_* has at least one zero in $I_{+\infty}$ and β is the leftmost one, then $\psi_*'(z)/\psi_*(z) > 0$ for $z \in (\alpha_L, \beta)$. So, $Q[\psi_*]$ can not have zeros in $z \in (\alpha_L, \beta)$ by the same reasoning as above. Thus, we obtain that ψ_* possesses *property A* at each of its real zero (if any). Consequently, ψ_* possesses *property A*.

We now prove that $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*') < Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*)$. There can be only the following two cases.

Case I. Let ψ_* have no real zeros. Then all real zeros of ψ_*' are extra zeros.

If ζ_* is a zero of $Q[\psi_*]$ of *even* multiplicity (at least two), then ζ_* is a zero of ψ_*' of odd multiplicity (at least three) according to (2.3). Thus, we have $E(\psi_*') \geqslant 3$. Now from (1.2) it follows that $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*) - Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*') \geqslant 2$, that is, $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*') < Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*)$.

If ζ_* is a zero of $Q[\psi_*]$ of *odd* multiplicity, then according to (2.3), ζ_* is a zero of ψ_*' of even multiplicity (at least two) and we have

$$E(\psi_*') \geqslant 2. \tag{2.4}$$

Note that ζ_* is an extremum point of ψ_*'/ψ_* in this case. Since $Q(z)$ is negative for $z \to \pm\infty$ (see the proof of Theorem 1), the function $\psi_*'(z)/\psi_*(z)$ is decreasing for all sufficiently large real z, so ψ_*'/ψ_* must have at least one local minimum and and at least one local maximum (and the numbers of local minima and local maxima are equal). Consequently, ζ_* must be a point of local maximum of ψ_*'/ψ_* by construction, and

$$\frac{\psi_*'(\zeta_* - \varepsilon)}{\psi_*(\zeta_* - \varepsilon)} < 0 \tag{2.5}$$

for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. Further, if the function ψ_* is not of the form (1.146), then ψ_* satisfies the inequalities (1.3) (the validity of these inequalities for functions with finitely many zeros is shown in Cases I and II of the proof of Theorem 2), from which it follows that $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*') < Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*)$ by (2.4). If ψ_* has the form (1.146), then we have

$$\frac{\psi_*'(z)}{\psi_*(z)} = \frac{p'(z)}{p(z)} - 2az + b, \quad a > 0, \tag{2.6}$$

where p is a real polynomial and $b \in \mathbb{R}$. Consequently, $\psi_*'(z)/\psi_*(z) \to +\infty$ whenever $z \to -\infty$, so ψ_*' has an odd number of zeros in $(-\infty, \zeta_*)$ according to (2.5). Thus, in this case, the inequality (2.4) can be improved to the following one.

$$E(\psi_*') \geqslant 3. \tag{2.7}$$

Now (1.2) and (2.7) yield $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*') < Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*)$.

Case II. Let now ψ_* have at least one real zero. Recall that all zeros of ψ_*' in the every interval I_j are extra zeros of ψ_*' except one, counting multiplicity. At the same time, all the zeros of ψ_*' in the intervals $I_{-\infty}$ and $I_{+\infty}$ are extra zeros of ψ_*'.

Let ψ_* have at least two real zeros and let $\zeta_* \in I_j$ for some j. If ζ_* is a zero of $Q[\psi_*]$ of *even* multiplicity, then ζ_* is a zero of ψ_*' of odd multiplicity (at least three). Since one zero of $\psi*$ in I_j is guaranteed by Rolle's theorem, we have the inequality (2.4) in this case. If ψ_*' is not of the form (1.146), then as above by (2.4) and (1.3), we obtain $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*') < Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*)$. If ψ_*' has the form (1.146), then the interval $I_{-\infty}$ exists in this case and ψ_*' has an odd number of extra zeros (at least one) in $I_{-\infty}$. In fact, $\psi_*'(z)/\psi_*(z) \to +\infty$ whenever $z \to -\infty$ and $\psi_*'(z)/\psi_*(z) \to -\infty$ whenever $z \nearrow \alpha_S$ by (1.9) and (2.6). Consequently, the inequality (2.7) holds in this case and from (1.2) it follows that $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*') < Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*)$.

If ζ_* is a zero of $Q[\psi_*]$ of *odd* multiplicity, then ζ_* is a zero of ψ_*' of even multiplicity (at least two). But by Rolle's theorem, ψ_* has an odd number of zeros in I_j. Therefore, if ψ_* is not of the form (1.146), then (2.4) is valid. If ψ_* is of the form (1.146), then, in this case, (2.7) can be proved by the same method as above. Thus, we also have $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*') < Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*)$ by (1.3) and (1.2).

Let ψ_* have at least one real zero and let $\zeta_* \in I_{-\infty}$ or $\zeta_* \in I_{+\infty}$. By the same reasoning as above, one can show that the inequality (2.7) holds in this case. So, we again obtain the inequality $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*') < Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*)$ by (1.2).

Thus, we have shown that for a given $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$, there exists a real σ_* such that the function $\psi_*(z) = e^{-\sigma_* z}\varphi(z)$ possesses *property A*. Additionally, if $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) > 0$, then $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*') < Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_*)$, as required. □

Remark 2.1. For a given function $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ the number σ_* guaranteed by Theorem 7 is not unique. For example, one can find another number applying Theorem 7 to the function $\varphi(-z)$.

Remark 2.2. We recall that, for φ and ψ_* of Theorem 7, we have $Q[\psi_*] = Q[\varphi]$ (see (2.1)).

Our last theorem establishes the Hawaii conjecture.

Theorem 8. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{P}^*$ and Q be a meromorphic function defined by* (1.4). *If φ has exactly $2m$ nonreal zeros, counting multiplicities, then the number of real zeros of Q, counting multiplicities, does not exceed $2m$.*

Proof. If $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) = 0$, then the theorem is true.

Let $Z_{\mathbb{R}}(Q) \neq 0$. Then according to Theorem 7, there exists a real σ_0 such that the function $\psi_0(z) = e^{-\sigma_0 z}\varphi(z)$ possesses property A and $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_0') < Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_0)$.

If $Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q_1[\psi_0]\right) \neq 0$, then we can apply Theorem 7 to ψ_0' to get a real σ_1 such that $\psi_1(z) = e^{-\sigma_1 z}\psi_0'(z)$ possesses *property A* and $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_1') < Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_1)$. If $Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q_1[\psi_1]\right) \neq 0$, then we can apply Theorem 7 to ψ_1' and so on. Thus, we obtain a sequence of the functions $\psi_0, \psi_1, \psi_2, \dots$ with *property A* satisfying the inequalities $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_j') < Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_j)$, where $\psi_j(z) = e^{-\sigma_j z}\psi_{j-1}'(z)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$

Since φ has finitely many nonreal zeros by assumption, the sequence of the functions ψ_j is finite. That is, there exists a nonnegative integer $l\,(\leqslant m-1)$ such that[7]

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q_1[\psi_l]\right) = 0, \tag{2.8}$$

[7]We notice that a necessary condition for the equality (2.8) is $Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_l) = Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_l')$.

while $Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_l]\right) > 0$.

By construction, all the functions ψ_j possess *property A*. Consequently, we can apply Theorem 2 to each of them to obtain

$$2m^{(j)} - 2m_1^{(j)} \leqslant Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_j]\right) \leqslant 2m^{(j)} - 2m_1^{(j)} + Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q_1[\psi_j]\right), \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, l, \tag{2.9}$$

where we use notation $2m^{(j)} = Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_j)$, $2m_1^{(j)} = Z_{\mathbb{C}}(\psi_j')$.

From (2.8) and (2.9) it follows that

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_l]\right) = 2m^{(l)} - 2m_1^{(l)}. \tag{2.10}$$

Further, the inequalities (2.9) imply

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_j]\right) - Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q_1[\psi_j]\right) \leqslant 2m^{(j)} - 2m_1^{(j)}, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, l-1. \tag{2.11}$$

By construction of the functions ψ_j (see Remark 2.2), we have

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q_1[\psi_j]\right) = Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_{j+1}]\right), \quad 2m_1^{(j)} = 2m^{(j+1)}, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, l-1.$$

Therefore, (2.11) can be rewritten in the form

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_j]\right) - Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_{j+1}]\right) \leqslant 2m^{(j)} - 2m^{(j+1)}, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, l-1. \tag{2.12}$$

Summing the inequalities (2.12) for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, l-1$, we obtain

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_0]\right) - Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_l]\right) = Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_0]\right) - Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_1]\right) + Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_1]\right) - Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_2]\right) +$$

$$+ Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_2]\right) - Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_3]\right) + \ldots + Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_{l-1}]\right) - Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_l]\right) \leqslant$$

$$\leqslant (2m^{(0)} - 2m^{(1)}) + (2m^{(1)} - 2m^{(2)}) + \ldots + (2m^{(l-1)} - 2m^{(l)}) = 2m^{(0)} - 2m^{(l)}.$$

This inequality and the equality (2.10) yield

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_0]\right) \leqslant 2m^{(0)} - 2m^{(l)} + Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q[\psi_l]\right) = 2m^{(0)} - 2m_1^{(l)} \leqslant 2m^{(0)}. \tag{2.13}$$

But by construction of ψ_0, we have $Q = Q[\psi_0]$ (see Remark 2.2) and $2m = 2m^{(0)}$. Therefore, the inequality (2.13) is exactly

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}}\left(Q\right) \leqslant 2m,$$

as required. □

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Thomas Craven, George Csordas, Alexander Eremenko, Olga Holtz, and Wayne Smith for helpful discussions and suggestions that promoted simplifications of some proofs.

References

[1] R.P. Boas, Entire functions, Academic press, New York, 1954.

[2] J. Borcea, B. Shapiro, *Classifying real polynomial pencils*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **69** (2004), 3689–3708.

[3] T. Craven, G. Csordas, and W. Smith, *The zeros of derivatives of entire functions and the Pólya-Wiman conjecture*, Ann. of Math. (2) **125** (1987), 405–431.

[4] T. Craven, G. Csordas, and W. Smith, *Zeros of derivatives of entire functions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **101** (1987), 323–326.

[5] G. Csordas, *Linear operators and the distribution of zeros of entire functions*, Complex Variables and Elliptic Equations (7) **51** (2006), 625–632.

[6] K. Dilcher, *Real Wronskian Zeros of polynomials with nonreal zeros*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **154** (1991), 164–183

[7] K. Dilcher, K.B. Stolarsky, *Zeros of the Wronskian of a polynomial*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **162** (1991), 430–451.

[8] S. Edwards, Private communication, 2008.

[9] N.M. Gyunter, R.O. Kuz'min, Problem book on higher mathematics. Vol. 2, Moscow, Gostechizdat, 1945. (in Russian)

[10] E. Laguerre, *Oeuvres*, vol. 1, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1898.

[11] B.Ja. Levin, Distribution of zeros of entire functions, Trans. Math. Monographs, vol. 5, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1964.

[12] G. Pólya, *Über Annäherung durch Polynome mit lauter reellen Wurzeln*, Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo **36** (1913), 279–295.

[13] T. Sheil-Small, Complex Polynomials, Cambridge Studies in Adv. Math. Vol. **75**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2002.